Labour Monthly

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

DEEDS, NOT WORDS

by

HARRY POLLITT

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Notes of the Month
The Price of Delay
by R.P.D.

and Articles by
HARRY POLLITT
BRUCE MINTON (U.S.A.)
GUNNER X-RAY
BEN BRADLEY
J. R. CAMPBELL
WILLIAM RUST
ALLEN HUTT
and
Book Reviews

OCTOBER 1942 VOL. 24 No. 10 6D

Editorial and Publishing Offices: 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3. Telephone: FIN. 5135

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OVER 23,500,000 !

Over 23,500,000 men and women mobilised, on full-time work in one capacity or another! This was the figure given by the Minister of Labour in his September 23 broadcast. With this increase in numbers, the need becomes still greater for an increase in political understanding of the fight against Fascism.

You have been enlightened by reading LABOUR MONTHLY and naturally discuss political events with your acquaintances in the workshop, street, train or where you may be. Why not bring these people together in a full discussion? This is how most of our groups have been formed. If your town is on the following list, you will be most cordially welcomed to their meetings together with your friends. Write to us and we will put you in touch, or give you the fullest assistance to start a group yourself.

LABOUR MONTHLY DISCUSSION GROUPS

(Places in **BOLD TYPE** are new Groups. Places in *Italics* are projected Groups)

(Please send STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE for particulars

LONDON AREA

Acton, Barking, Barnet, Beckenham, Belsize Park, Bethnal Green, Burnt Oak, Chiswick, Clapton, **COLINDALE**, East Ham, Edgware, Edmonton, Enfield, Finchley, Forest Gate, Fulham, Golders Green, Greenwich, Hampstead, Hampstead Garden Suburb, Hanwell, Harringay, Highgate, Holborn, Ilford, Kensington (North), Kensington (South), Lambeth, Leyton, Marylebone, Morden, Palmers Green, Putney, Southfields, Twickenham, Walthamstow, Wandsworth, Wembley, Westminster, Willesden, Winchmore Hill, Woodford.

HOME COUNTIES

Addington, Amersham, Ashtead, Banstead, Basingstoke, Beaconsfield, **BECCLES**, Bishops Stortford, Braintree, Brentwood, Bromley, Buckhurst Hill, **BURGH HEATH**, Bushey, Bush Hill Park, Caterham, *Canvey Island*, Chelmsford, Chingford (North), Chingford (South), Chingford (Friday Hill), Claygate and Esher, Crowthorne, Croxley Green, Didcot, Dunstable, East Grinstead, Epsom, Gerrards Cross, Goring-on-Thames, Gravesend, Grays, Greenford, Guildford, Harold Wood, Harpenden, Harrow, Hatfield, Hayes (Middlesex), Hertford, Hillingdon, Hitchin, Horsham, Horsham, Kenton, Letchworth, Maidenhead, Maidstone, Maldon (Essex), North Harrow and Rayners Lane, Orpington, Pinner, Pitsea, Princes Risborough, Radlett, Ruislip, St. Albans, *Sevenoaks, Shadoxhurst*, **SIDCUP** (Kent), Slough, *Staines*, Sunbury-on-Thames, Upminster, Wallingford, Wallington, Watford, Welling, Welwyn, *Wickford*, Windsor and Eton.

PROVINCES

Abercynon, Aberdeen, *Aberystwyth*, Abertillery, Alfreton and Ripley, Alexandria, Altrincham, Andover, Ashford (Kent), Assington, Ayr, Bacup, Banbury, Barnstaple, Bath, Batley, Beaumaris, *Bebington & Bromborough*, Biddulph, Birkenhead, Birmingham, Blackpool, Blyth, Bognor Regis, Boston, Bournemouth Bridgend, Bristol, Buckhaven, *Burgess Hill*, **CAMBRIDGE**, Cardiff, Cardigan, Carlisle, Castle Douglas, Castleford, Cheadle, Cheltenham, Chester, Chippenham, Chorley, **CLEVELEYS**, Cirencester, Clevedon, Clifton (Bristol), Cockermouth, Cwmllynfell, Cudworth, **DARTON**, Dawley Bank, Doncaster, **DUNOON**, Edinburgh, Exeter, Farnborough (Hants), Farnham, Fawley, *Felixstowe*, Glasgow, Gloucester, Grantham, Greenock, Guiseley, Halifax, Heanor, Hebburn, Hereford, *High Wycombe*, Huyton, Hyde, **ILKLEY**, *Inverurie*, Jarrow, Kendal, Kidderminster, Leeds, Leicester, Lemington-on-Tyne, Leyland, Liverpool, Llanelly, Llangollen, Lowestoft, Macclesfield, **MALVERN**, Mansfield, Marple, Merseyside, Middlesbrough, Milngavie, Minehead, **MILTON**, Morpeth, Moss Park (Glasgow), Neath, Nelson, Netley, Newark, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Newcastle (Staffs), New Mills, Newtown, *North Ockendon*, Northallerton, Nuneaton, Penrith, Petersfield, Pluckley, Portchester, Portsmouth, Preston, **RADFORD** (Notts), Rawtenstall, Reading, Renton, Rhondda, Rugby, Ryton, Saffron Walden, St. Helens, Salisbury, Saltcoats, Scunthorpe, Sedgeley, **SHEFFIELD**, Shrewsbury, Skipton, Somerton, Stafford, Stockport, Stoke-on-Trent, *Stornoway*, Stroud, Sunderland, Swindon, Talgarth, Taunton, **THORNEBANK**, **THORPE**, Thurso, Tonypandy, Tonyrefail, Tunbridge Wells, Wallsend, Wareham, Warrington, Warwick, Wednesbury, *Wellingborough*, Westbury, Weston-super-Mare, Whitstable, **WICK** (Caithness), Winchester, **WITNEY**, Wolverhampton, Woodbridge, Worcester, Workington, Worthing, Wrexham, Yarmouth, Yeadon, Yeovil.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

October, 1942—The Prime Minister's Speech—Negative Content—Anglo-American Strategic Agreement—Truth about Moscow Conference—No United Allied Strategy—The Aftermath—Playing Down the Second Front—Pointers in the Wind—Trades Union Congress Discussion—Dishonouring a Pledge?—No Second Front Without Mass Pressure—The Path of Surrender—Reorganise the Government and General Staff—Political Conclusions

THE plain, harsh truth of the present situation must be faced. October is upon us. Three quarters of the year have passed—of the year within which the solemn pledge was given by the American and British Governments that the Second Front in Europe would be established before the end of 1942. There is still no Second Front in the West. There is still no unified allied strategy. Since the Moscow Conference the divergence is open. Hitler is still permitted by the Anglo-American High Command to concentrate all his forces on one front, the Russian front. For fifteen months the Soviet Union has, in Mr. Churchill's phrase, "stood up to the whole weight of the Teutonic armies," while in the fourth year of war Britain is still, according to the official version, "not ready." Amid a ministerial chorus of "To-day and not To-morrow," To-Morrow continues to be preferred to To-Day. The price is being paid with millions of Russian lives to-day: what will be the price in the West to-morrow? The sands of the victory which the strength of Soviet resistance had placed within our grasp are slipping through the glass. The outlook of the war is grimly serious.

MR. CHURCHILL'S speech of September 8 was, in its final significance, despite all the confident language, a retreat. It was a retreat from the explicit definiteness of the May 26 pledge affirming the "complete understanding" of the British, American and Soviet Governments with regard to "the urgent tasks of creating a Second Front in Europe in 1942." The pledge was passed over in silence, and was replaced by a very much vaguer reference to future offensive plans without a date. Nor was this vagueness only a reflection of necessary and justifiable caution in relation to future strategic plans. Such caution need not have excluded any reference to the pledge, or the plain reaffirmation of its validity, which would have added nothing to the knowledge of the enemy, but would have done much to restore the confidence of the public and to strike a blow at the wrecking activities of the saboteurs and enemies of the Second Front.

MORE than this. The negative character of the main outcome of the Moscow Conference in the field of strategy was for the first time explicitly admitted. A close examination of the hard kernel of the speech beneath the glittering wrappings of glowing tributes makes this inescapably clear. It is necessary to recall the circumstances and the sequence of dates. The Anglo-American-Soviet Agreement on the Second Front was announced on June 10. Immediately after, the Prime Minister set off to the United States to

Vol. XXIV. No. 10 October, 1942

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER

		Page
Notes of the Month—*The Price of Delay*	*by* R. P. D.	289
Deeds, Not Words	*by* HARRY POLLITT	295
Situation in the U.S.A.	*by* BRUCE MINTON	301
Soldiers' Pay and the Second Front	*by* GUNNER X-RAY	303
India must be Freed	*by* BEN BRADLEY	306
Blackpool T.U.C. and After	*by* J. R. CAMPBELL	308
How the Ban was Lifted	*by* WILLIAM RUST	313
Ceux de Valmy, 1792-1942	*by* ALLEN HUTT	318
Reviews		320

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meet President Roosevelt—not with Molotov, but as soon as Molotov had left. The purpose and outcome of this Churchill-Roosevelt meeting in mid-June, immediately following the Second Front announcement which had been the principal positive achievement of Premier Molotov's visit to London and Washington at the end of May and the beginning of June, was not announced. But according to the Washington view, "the best opinion here is that Churchill arrived, not to plan a Second Front this year, but to dissuade the President from attempting one," reports the usually well-informed Washington correspondent of the New York *Nation* on June 27, 1942.

DURING July followed the Anglo-American strategic conference. At this Conference the United States was represented by General Marshall, the head of the United States Army, Admiral King, the head of the Navy, and Mr. Hopkins, the President's personal representative. These high representatives met the members of the British War Cabinet, the British War Cabinet Defence Committee and the British Chiefs of Staff. The Soviet Union was apparently not represented. At this Conference, declares Churchill, after the final approval of President Roosevelt, "by the end of July complete agreement on war policy and war plans had been reached between Great Britain and the United States. This agreement covers the whole field of the war in every part of the world." Observe "between Great Britain and the United States," although the "agreement covers the whole field of the war in every part of the world." The language of "complete agreement"—between Great Britain and the United States—is here absolute, explicit and without qualifications. Thus this Anglo-American "complete agreement" on strategy was reached prior to the Moscow Conference and without the participation of the Soviet Union.

"ARMED," Mr. Churchill went on, "armed with this body of agreement between Great Britain and the United States," Mr. Churchill travelled to the Soviet Union in Moscow—to "speak his mind," as he subsequently declared in his farewell message. What was the outcome of the Moscow Conference in the field of strategy? The language of the Prime Minister's report to the House of Commons on the outcome of the Moscow Conference in the field of strategy is markedly different in character from that describing the outcome of the Anglo-American Conference in July. There is no longer any reference to "complete agreement on war policy and war plans" as having been reached at Moscow. On the contrary, despite the warmest tribute to "the prodigious feat of the resistance of Russia alone to the equivalent of the whole weight of the Teutonic armies," the hard facts of the report revealed:—

(1) that "the Russians do not think that we or the Americans have done enough so far to take the weight off them";

(2) that "it is difficult to make the Russians comprehend all the problems";

(3) that the answer to this from the British side was an endeavour to convince the Soviet leaders of the "loyal and sincere resolve" of Britain and the United States to help "as quickly as possible . . . so long as the contribution was towards victory."

THE contrast to the "complete agreement on war policy and war plans" triumphantly reported as the outcome of the Anglo-American Conference is unmistakable. Is it likely that, if agreement had been reached, the light would have been hidden behind a bushel, and such a triumphant achievement of allied unity in practice against Hitler would have been

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

concealed behind such a halting and apologetic report? It is impossible to escape the conclusion, which must strike every unprejudiced observer in the face, that the outcome of the Moscow Conference on the main issue of strategy was negative in character, and that a united allied strategy has not yet been achieved in practice, despite the agreement in principle embodied in the May 26 pledge.

THIS conclusion is reinforced by the character of the subsequent press references on both sides. On the one side, by the character of the controversy in the British press. On the other side, by the increasingly urgent and emphatic character of the references in the Soviet press to the question of the Second Front, following the Moscow Conference; the open reference to the conflict in British-American opinion on this issue and to the campaign of wide sections of British and American opinion for the fulfilment of the Second Front agreement; and the explicit warning by the Foreign Editor of *Pravda* in September against the rôle of the Munichites in Britain, "groups known for their hostility to the working classes and the U.S.S.R., and at the same time for their fidelity to the principles which were the basis of the Munich Agreement."

FURTHER reinforcement to this conclusion is provided by the character of official and semi-official utterance in the period following the Second Front agreement of May 26. Not only the open declarations and hostile campaign of the Kemsley press and of the organs of reaction (the "We are for the Second Front, but——" school) but the whole trend of official and semi-official utterance, and of the main bulk of the standard press, London and provincial, Ministry of Information propaganda, inspired speeches or the B.B.C., has been to play down the Second Front and suggest a line of retreat from the May 26 policy: (1) By damping down in every possible way the demand for the Second Front, deprecating public discussion of the issue or agitation for it, and suggesting that such demand comes only from an extremist minority; (2) by harping inexhaustibly on the dangers, difficulties and risks of any Second Front in Europe, the insuperable obstacles to be overcome, and the necessity of avoiding any premature, hasty, rash or ill-prepared enterprise; (3) by playing up any and every alternative to the Second Front in Europe as a possibly "just as good" or even superior substitute, and especially cracking up air-bombing as the magic formula for victory; (4) by presenting every other front, however minute or remote or limited in its actual engaging of Nazi forces as an alternative to the Second Front in Europe, as a Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth or Seventh Front, replacing the necessity of the Second Front in Europe. The line running through all this monotonously repeated propaganda is unmistakable.

SIMILARLY, every incidental ministerial or official utterance has provided pointers in the same direction. On July 26 the Hon. David Bowes-Lyon, visiting the United States as an official of the Ministry of Economic Warfare, that is, as a Government representative, informed the American reporters: "We don't view the Second Front just as you do. The real Second Front is the bombing over Europe." On the same day Mr. Ernest Bevin, a member of the War Cabinet, speaking at Pontypool, stated that the demand for the Second Front was "causing a division in the country," and that the Second Front was "not the only way to win the war." On July 28 Air-Marshal Harris, in a broadcast approved by the Government, forecast air-bombing as the weapon of victory: "No matter how far your armies march, they cannot get to England. . . . Whatever their victories, you will still have to settle the air war with us and America." And so on without end.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NO less significant were the declarations at the Trades Union Congress on the part of representatives of the General Council in opposition to the Engineers' resolution for the "immediate organisation" of the Second Front, as provided in the May 26 agreement. The declarations of reactionary representatives in the Labour movement are often especially important as pointers to the real content of Government policy, as they commonly express in more crude and blatant form what the Government is more careful to dress up in diplomatic verbiage. Thus Mr. Charles Dukes stated with regard to the Second Front that "we cannot be tied down to a time-table" (*Daily Telegraph* report); or (in the words of the *Daily Herald* report): "I ask Congress to decline to tie us down to a time-table without at least giving us some modicum of evidence, on which some are so sure, that the time should be within the next three months." It will be seen that here the very essence of the May 26 agreement, pledging "the Second Front in Europe in 1942" (*i.e.*, "tying us down to a time-table" and "within the next three months") is explicitly repudiated and condemned, as if no agreement were in existence and no signature required to be honoured.

THE conclusion to which all this points is inescapable. It needs to be ruthlessly faced. The political consequences need to be drawn. They need to be made the basis of appropriate action. It is already sufficiently serious that four months after the May 26 pledge, alongside the most crucial battles of the war, there is still no Second Front in Europe. It is still more serious that all present indications suggest that this delay may be even further and more disastrously prolonged, unless the popular campaign compels a change. There are too many indications that the official policy is rather directed towards the objectives of intensified air-bombing of Germany, the repetition of raids of the Dieppe type, or the possible extension of operations in Africa, as alternatives to the establishment of the Second Front in Europe in the present critical and decisive situation, with the prospect of the Second Front in Europe relegated to 1943. We are not here concerned with the question by what legalistic casuistries the attempt may be made to present such a policy as an "interpretation" of the explicit pledge of the establishment of the Second Front in Europe in 1942. We are very much concerned with the facts.

IT is certainly a serious matter to suggest that a pledge, publicly entered into, between three leading allied Governments engaged in the common task of the defeat of Hitlerism, recognised and acclaimed by the three nations concerned and by all the nations of the world, and vital for the whole strategy of the war, might conceivably under certain circumstances fail to be fulfilled. But it is more important to face the facts, however harsh and unwelcome, while there is still time by a mighty united effort to prevent a catastrophe which would be more grave in its consequences than Munich, than to remain wilfully blind behind the self-deceiving motto "Trust the experts"—the motto which covered the betrayal of France—in order after the event to weep and moan and write epitaphs and conduct inquests on the ruin of a world. There is still time, though hardly time, to prevent catastrophe. But the beginning of recovery is to face the facts at their worst. *We must frankly recognise that only the most powerful and enormously intensified mass pressure of the overwhelming majority of the nation can now ensure, against the deadweight of political and technical obstruction, the speedy establishment of the Second Front in Europe in the present critical and decisive hour of the war when its role is essential for joint victory.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IMMEDIATELY after the announcement of the Second Front agreement in June, in our commentary on it in the July issue of this journal, we felt it necessary to sound the warning: "The political issue is not finished.":—

> "It would be a profound error to under-estimate the still continuing strength and activity of the Munichite pro-Fascist and anti-Soviet forces. They have received a heavy blow with the present alliance and the measure of agreement reached on the question of the Second Front in Europe. But they have not acknowledged defeat. . . . The Munichites are continuing the fight, irrespective of the governmental agreement. The political issue is not finished."

THE truth of this has been abundantly shown in the months which have followed. The Fifth Column in high places, the Munichites, the reactionary enemies of maximum united action against Fascism, those who fear victory with the Soviet Union more than they fear the menace of Hitler, have intensified their activity. Entrenched in a whole series of commanding positions; occupying expert strategic vantage points in the staffs and services since the days of Chamberlain; represented in the Government; manipulating the threads and wires of upper class behind-the-scenes politics (while deprecating public political agitation); controlling powerful organs of the press; utilising also the blind anti-Soviet and anti-Communist frenzy of reactionary leaders in the Labour movement who seek to follow the suicidal path of German Social Democracy; and taking advantage, it must be added, of the false security and credulous optimism of wide sections of the people lulled by the public pledge; they have pressed forward their undermining activity to retard and paralyse the action of the Government, to weaken its resolve, and to spread confusion, uncertainty and bewilderment among the people. Their activities have now reached such a point that the most urgent political campaign is essential to strike them down and clear the path for the Second Front.

THERE is no room for mistaking where the path of these forces leads. At present they speak only of postponement and delay of the Second Front until a more favourable season, until 1943, until the accumulation of a more favourable superiority of forces on the Anglo-American side. They appear only as the advocates of caution and dilatory prudence, opposing rash and over-hasty enterprises. But they know very well the facts that lie behind their arguments. They know very well that if their arguments (which coincide with the arguments of Goebbels and Hitler) prevail to paralyse the action of Britain and the United States in the present decisive hour, so that Hitler should be enabled to carry through his plan of immobilising the offensive power of the Soviet Union in the East in order to turn with his main forces West, then their present very weak and shaky arguments to show the impossibility of facing one-tenth of Hitler's forces in the West to-day would be reinforced a hundredfold to prove the impossibility of facing ten times the forces in the West next spring.

THEN—and not till then—the political implications of their present line would begin to creep out into the light of day. Petain and Weygand also did not begin as the advocates of surrender. They began by organising the defeat, in order then to prove the inevitability of surrender. So, too, their counterparts in this country appear to-day in the cloak of the prophets of caution. Only if they succeeded in their fell work, seeking to sabotage the victory which is to-day in our grasp, and to create conditions of extreme danger and disaster, would they throw off the cloak of the prophets of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

caution and appear in their true guise as the apostles of defeat. Behind the cloak of caution is hidden the body of defeat and the heart of surrender. The path of the opponents of the Second Front in 1942 is not the path of caution. It is the path of surrender to Hitler.

THE united will and action of the entire nation must defeat these manoeuvres of dishonour and disaster. The vote of one and a half millions at the Trades Union Congress for the "immediate organisation" of the Second Front, following Tanner's exposure of the enemy forces, and representing the organisations of all the key workers in war industry, was a first powerful blow against the enemies of victory. The campaign must now be carried forward and intensified to draw in all sections of the Labour movement and all supporters of victory over Fascism. Even the blindest, the most credulous and trustful in the "competent authorities" (despite the damning record of years of Himalayan blunders in the past, wherever the popular demand was resisted by the supposed superior wisdom of reactionary pigmies) must now see that, with October upon us, four months after the pledge, alongside the crucial battles of Stalingrad, with the most dangerous indications of retreat from the pledged policy, we cannot afford to hold back or wait on events; we must throw all we have into the fight. Our campaign will not weaken those in the Government and in the High Command or ruling positions who stand for action; it will strengthen their hands. But it must weaken those who oppose and retard action and are at present successfully preventing it. The political conclusions from the present situation must be ruthlessly drawn. Never was so much at stake.

THE spirit animating the campaign must be the most inflexible determination to overcome every obstacle which stands in the way of the immediate establishment of the Second Front in Europe. Whether those obstacles are political or technical, whether they lie in the kindred spheres of political reaction or professional routinism or technical incapacity, they must be broken. It is essential to exclude from every commanding position every enemy of the Second Front in 1942 and of that unified allied strategy which is the key to victory. This applies equally to the staff committees and military commands, and to ministerial positions. We must demand the reorganisation of the Government to exclude the Halifaxes and the Simons, the Griggs and the Amerys. The present testing-time of the nation requires a Government which can and will organise and carry through, in the face of whatever opposition and resistance from high places, on the basis of mass support, the Second Front without delay, in accordance with its pledged policy and the manifest needs of the war situation, and will make whatever changes are necessary in the General Staff and commanding positions to secure the execution of this policy.

THE greatest responsibility rests on the organised Labour movement, which has only to be united to lead the entire nation and to be capable of enforcing its will, to respond to the needs of the hour, to defeat the manoeuvres of the pro-Fascist reactionaries and defeatists, and to spur on the Government and the nation to carry out the necessary programme of victory. The lines of the campaign which is now essential are set out in the article by Harry Pollitt which follows these Notes, and to which special attention is drawn, under the title "Deeds, Not Words." These are now the final decisive weeks of the decisive year. We must fight to win this political battle on the home front, in order to win the crucial battles of the war.

R. P. D.

Sept. 20, 1942.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Deeds, Not Words

by HARRY POLLITT

THE debâcle that took place at the resumption of Parliament on September 8, on the occasion of the Parliamentary debate to hear and discuss Mr. Churchill's report on the war situation, reveals something much deeper than the desire of Members of Parliament to get a quick lunch. It shows a political demoralisation at the centre of the Government and in Parliament, the bodies in which the leadership of Britain is invested, that finds no counterpart in the ranks of the common people.

Consider the circumstances in which this shameful exhibition took place. Parliament had been on holiday for four weeks. The Prime Minister had made very important visits to the Soviet Union and Egypt. The position in India, where at any time Japan may make a direct attack, was one of complete deadlock. Certain important changes had been made in the High Command in the Middle East. Churchill and Stalin had met for the first time, and the Red Army was still fighting alone against the whole might of Hitler's gigantic war machine, with a resistance and tenacity that our own newspapers describe as "incredible."

There was world-wide interest in what the Prime Minister had to say about the Government's future policy, an interest not confined to the people of the United Nations, but to all who are enslaved by Fascism. Outside Parliament there was a formidable mass movement demanding the Second Front, one growing more apprehensive that the hopes aroused by the Eden declaration in May regarding a Second Front in Europe in 1942 was now being deliberately side-stepped by the Government.

In short, a situation in which everyone understands that the whole future of the war depends upon the policy to be carried through in the coming weeks and months, in which everyone feels we had reached the most urgent and critical stage of the war, when upon present policy depends the alternative of either short and victorious war, or a war which can be prolonged for years with all its incalculable consequences.

The people expected that both the Government and Parliament would fearlessly face up to this situation.

The nation received a blow in the face, and the utmost indignation raged in the factories and amongst the armed forces. Public opinion in other countries received a shock that lowered Britain's prestige throughout the world.

What happened cannot be allowed to be lightly forgotten. During the Prime Minister's speech, many Members of Parliament walked out. As soon as he had finished there was a general exodus to the dining-room. The anticipated and necessary two-day debate on the war situation ended in a complete fiasco.

No evasions or excuses can hide the real explanation. There is one, and one only. It is lack of political leadership on the part of the Government and Parliament itself that led to this position. It is the absence of any win-the-war policy that can command the complete support of Parliament. It was the recognition that there was nothing new or positive in the Prime Minister's speech; that the peoples' demand for immediate united offensive action on the part of the three Services was being resisted in high places. The Moscow Conference had not produced the result, so eagerly anticipated, that at long last the Eden declaration* on the Second Front in 1942 was now to be implemented.

What could have been a turning-point in the fight against Fascism, namely, Churchill's visit to Stalin, did not materialise. It did not produce half the positive reaction of Molotov's visit to this country in May, because it became clear in the course of the Prime Minister's statement that the decisive question of the Second Front was not going to be raised. Eulogies of Stalin did not hide the grim fact that Churchill had to report that the Soviet Government "did not think that we or America had done enough," or that

* Mr. Eden, on behalf of the Government, declared that arising out of the conversations with Molotov in May, "agreement had been reached on the urgent task of creating a Second Front in Europe in 1942."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he was compelled to declare that in the future, it is "deeds, not words," that count.

In this situation, it was the duty of Members of Parliament not to rush out for their lunch, but to challenge with their own constructive proposals the weaknesses that were revealed. The country expected deeds from Mr. Churchill; it got words. But the only deed that can win the complete confidence of the peoples of the United Nations is the opening of the Second Front.

It is this which lies at the heart of the political and military crisis into which we are fast moving. Until this is recognised, we shall stagger and stumble along, what time our Soviet allies are pouring out their blood in a way that has no parallel in world history.

The people of Britain demand a Government that will organise the Second Front, for they watch with shame the one-sided character of the present fight.

At the very moment when the Government and Parliament were shaming themselves in the eyes of the world, the Red Army newspaper *Red Star* was issuing a call to the Red Army that will be remembered for all time. Of the need to defend Stalingrad to the last man, it stated:—

> The defenders of Stalingrad have no choice, just as the heroes of 1918 had none. They must defend the city. In those difficult days when Tsaritsin was on the edge of perishing, Stalin gave the order to bring away to the north all water transport.
>
> The Army knew and welcomed it with grave firmness. Everybody understood: "There is no way of retreat for us, there is only one road left—against the enemy." It is the same thing now. There is no way back from Stalingrad. It is closed by the Fatherland's will and by the order of the people. The Fatherland demands of the city's defenders: "Fight to a finish with Stalingrad held." Now at Stalingrad Soviet warriors, unheedful of everything save their duty to the Fatherland, must fight a deathly battle against the enemy.

There is only one way to get the full effects of that call, that is to make a British analogy. Suppose, on the collapse of France in 1940, our Government had stated: "There is no way out of France. There will be no ships to bring British troops back to England. Fight to a deathly finish." What would have been thought and felt in Britain then?

The *Red Star* call does three things. First, it brands with everlasting shame those anti-Soviet speakers like John Marchbank, who at the Blackpool Trades Union Congress hinted at a change in the policy of the Communist Party towards the war if the situation changed, meaning by that only one thing, the possible capitulation of the Soviet Union. Secondly, it is a call to the people of Britain that must find an immediate response, above all, in the ranks of the key sections of the organised workers. Thirdly, it is a challenge to the intentions of our own Government with regard to the fulfilment of the peoples' demand for the Second Front.

While Parliament was displaying its irresponsibility and lack of leadership, the Workers' Parliament—the Trades Union Congress—was in session at Blackpool. It was giving the world concrete evidence of the new awakening that is taking place in the ranks of the organised workers. The Blackpool Trades Union Congress marks for good and all the end of the domination of a solid *bloc* of reactionary Labour leaders. On every decisive issue, the will of the rank and file found expression in votes running into millions. Political observers know that it is the first time for many years that this has taken place.

There was a new understanding of the need for working-class unity in the votes cast for removing the bans on the rights of the Communists in the Trades Unions and Trades Councils; a determination to strengthen every aspect of the productive effort and to give greater responsibility to the workers, with increased facilities to play a more vital and direct part in the organisation of war industry; there was a keenness expressed for international Trades Union unity, and a great resentment at the shameful Vansittart utterances of the President of the Trades Union Congress.

It was well known that if the ban on the *Daily Worker* had not been lifted, Congress would have demanded this by a majority of over a million, despite all the intrigues that have been going on since the Labour Party Conference to prevent this.

Most important of all, despite a series of back-stairs manoeuvres to prevent the raising of it, over one and a half million

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

votes were cast for the immediate opening of the Second Front. And let no one under-estimate the significance of where these votes came from. They came from the miners, engineers, locomotive engine drivers and firemen, foundry workers, electricians and fire-fighters. These are the key-forces in Britain. The spirit represented by these key sections of the working class are those which represent the real Britain. They are those upon which we now have to build to end the present paralysis in the Government, Parliament and official circles of the Labour movement. For no useful purpose is served by pretending that the part being played by certain reactionary Labour leaders is not having its effect on the policy of the Government at the present time.

The Labour movement cries aloud for unity and leadership. It demands a combined offensive policy against Fascism at the only decisive place where it can be made—the continent of Europe. It demands an end to the sectional rivalries and claims for priority on the part of the High Commands of the Army, Navy and Air Force. The rank and file of the Labour movement feels more strongly than any other section of the community that we are letting our blood brothers of the Soviet Union down, and realise the terrible price that will have to be paid for this betrayal. It is ashamed of the existing defensive and complacent spirit that enables the new type of defeatism to cover up its tracks by pretending that General Winter and Russian snow can become Russia's best allies.

Instead of getting the leadership the situation demands, the Labour movement is treated to endless and unseemly public squabbles among the Parliamentary Labour Party. It gets the pitiful type of document issued by the Labour Party leaders on the fourth anniversary of the outbreak of war, in which the call is made for intensified war, not on the Nazis, but on the Communists and on all who support the work of the Anglo-Soviet Solidarity Committees. History will not deal lightly with those who are responsible for this bankruptcy of leadership.

What needs to be understood by every serious member of the Labour movement is that at rock bottom, the reactionary section of Labour's leaders are responsible for the present position in Britain. It is not the electoral truce which explains the present political situation, or the passivitiy of many local sections of the Labour Party. It is not the fact that so many active labour workers are all immersed in some form of war work as is so often made out, that explains the widespread feelings of frustration and disquiet to be found in the Labour Party. It is the fact that the electoral truce is deliberately interpreted to mean absence of political activity and campaigns to strengthen the unity of the nation for victory. This is what leads to the frustration, which mistakenly finds expression in loud talk about grand schemes of post-war reconstruction, and the need "for more direct socialist measures from Mr. Churchill as evidence of his good faith towards Labour"—chatter that is simply the alibi for inability to face up to the concrete problems of the present situation, the successful solution of which can alone determine the character of the world we will live in when victory has been won.

This it is which encourages the growth of the so-called "independent" groupings, which are foreign and basically opposed to the fundamental principles of the Labour movement. This is the principal reason why there is not only chaos and deep discontent at the Government candidates chosen in by-elections, but why the Independents get such significant votes. It is this lack of leadership, above all, on the part of the official Labour leaders which is fomenting all the dangerous talk about "the old gang has failed"—the first slogan of every incipient Fascist group that has ever emerged.

Alongside these developments other tendencies must be noted. First, the frequent rumours that certain members of the Government are going to resign because they too feel frustrated and disquieted at the arbitrary manner in which policy is decided, the lack of collective leadership, and the one-man decisions on main strategical issues in the conduct of the war.

Secondly, the veiled threats made from time to time in certain political circles that if there is not unquestioned obedience to the policy of the Prime Minister, it may be necessary to set up some form

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of military dictatorship through which all vital decisions can be made without any troublesome parliamentary debates.

The whole position is dangerous in the extreme and only the most decisive intervention of the rank and file of the Labour movement, backed by all those leaders who are seriously concerned at the present state of affairs, can bring about the changes that are so urgently essential, if Britain is to become fully united and mobilised for victory.

There is only one force in the country that can bring about this change. That is the organised Labour movement.

Unless it acts, and acts quickly, political demoralisation can grow and become a serious obstacle to victory at the very moment when the maximum national unity and effort is necessary.

Let us face facts. If no Second Front is speedily opened, then whatever the character of the R.A.F. raids in Germany, whatever partial diversionary actions are organised either on the European coast or elsewhere, neither of these can draw the necessary numbers of Nazi divisions away from the Eastern Front.

If this does not take place, then Hitler, on the basis of his mobilisation of all Europe and in view of the heavy blows that the Red Army has already sustained, can temporarily cripple the Red Army as an offensive fighting force this year, and turn important sections of his war machine directly against Britain. Those who, like the delegate at the Trades Union Congress, shout out "Let it come," can have no idea of what this would be like. It would, of course, be resisted by every means in our power, but the fact that this advantageous position for Hitler had been allowed to materialise would rouse the masses in such a way as to have very inconvenient repercussions for the present leaders of the Tory, Labour and Liberal Parties.

We are, therefore, now in a position in which it is the duty of every responsible person, whether in the rank and file or the leadership of the chief political parties fearlessly to face up to what is at stake without regard to Party labels, affiliations or personal considerations.

The position can be changed. The country can be firmly united, but it must be upon the basis of a policy and leadership that, as the very foundation of its win-the-war policy, understands that at this moment the United Nations have at their disposal both the forces and resources to enable them to take the offensive against Hitler and bring about his utter defeat.

In this connection *The Times*, in its leader of September 9, 1942, commenting on the Parliamentary debate to which we have referred, made the following comment :—

> . . . But the singleness of allied strategy, which alone can ensure that the choice of the place and the time in so vital a matter is rightly made, will remain exceedingly difficult to attain so long as one ally is locked in mortal struggle while the others are still in a phase of preparation. That this phase has extended for Great Britain into a fourth year of war remains, despite the disasters that partly explain it, a reproach in our own sight and in the sight of our allies which the effort of the whole nation, civilian workers and fighting men, is concerned to remove. Only when it is transcended can we expect the emergence of that master design of unified allied strategy which can bring to an end the period when an Anglo-American war, mainly by sea, indirectly aids the Russian war by land, and begin to wage that single war on two fronts or more which Hitler most dreads, and has evaded too long.

Coming from such a source it needs to be taken seriously, revealing as it does that not only amongst the advanced workers is there a feeling of alarm over the present situation, but that other important circles of public opinion also grasp what is at stake and what needs to be done if victory is to be achieved.

We believe that it is now the duty of every section of the Labour movement to do all in their power to strengthen every aspect of this country's leadership and war effort. To that end we put forward as a basis of discussion the following proposals:—

(1) Basing ourselves on the mighty volume of public opinion demanding the Second Front and especially the decisive Trade Unions in the basic industries of this country, that there shall now be the most effective political campaign that this country has ever organised, to force the Government to open the Second Front, and to reach agreement on the Indian question. These two issues, once solved, will do more than anything else to unite not only the British people, but the peoples of the United Nations. So long as the present position obtains, so long is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the absence of a Second Front and the inability to get the active co-operation of the entire Indian nation not only a source of weakness and concern to Britain but to the Soviet Union, the United States of America and China and an invaluable weapon in the already powerful arsenal of Hitler.

(2) We propose that the National Council of Labour should convene a special Emergency National Conference of all working-class organisations pledged to the fight against Fascism, to determine and reach agreement upon a "win-the-war" policy. Such Emergency National Conferences have been organised at other critical periods in our history. We have in mind the one organised in 1920 to help the Soviet Union when it was fighting against armed intervention. We believe that such a Conference now can play an extremely important part in helping both the British and Soviet people to save themselves from Fascism.

(3) On the basis of the policy reached at such a Conference, to propose a joint Conference between the leaders of all working-class parties, together with the Tory, Liberal and other organisations taking their stand against Fascism, with a view of reaching agreement on an all-in united national campaign in which every propaganda resource is used in mobilising the entire people.

(4) To reach agreement between the Tory, Labour, Liberal and Communist Parties, as to the candidates to be put forward in all future by-elections, the basis of selection to be not any special Party or Trade Union claims but the best and most capable anti-Fascist leaders that can be brought forward to strengthen Parliament and the Government.

(5) To strengthen the Government by the removal of Amery, Grigg, Halifax, Simon, Hoare; to demand that the work of the War Cabinet should be conducted on the basis of a real collective leadership, consultation, decision and responsibility.

(6) To fight for a Government that will organise the Second Front; will organise a unified allied strategy and leadership, and will make whatever changes in the present General Staff that can guarantee this policy will be carried out; which can command the complete and unstinted confidence of the whole of the British people and the rest of the United Nations.

Proceeding alongside such a campaign as this, it is also necessary for the working class to prove, in the only way it can, how determined it is, whether its members are in industry, the armed forces or civil defence, that nothing is going to be left undone, and to show by deeds that we are ready to respond to every call and to make every kind of sacrifice.

Concretely, this means doing all we can to increase production; to become the best possible soldiers, sailors and airmen; the most skilful and resourceful in every aspect of civil defence, a vital sector of the fighting front on which this autumn and winter there is going to be a very great deal to do.

It means rooting out every vestige of complacency and wishful thinking from our ranks; it means fighting for unity as zealously as we fight for increased production. It means setting the personal example wherever we are and whatever we do, to make certain that we fulfil every obligation that the fight against Fascism places upon us.

Above all, it means that we shall rid ourselves of any traces of inferiority complex, such as is so prevalent now in the ranks of those who oppose the Second Front when they say that it is a question to be left to the "competent authorities." Refuse to be bemused by this high-sounding phrase.

The political instincts of the workers are always right on every vital question. It is not the masses who are responsible for all the disasters that Britain has had to face. The masses are the heart of the nation. Upon them everything in the last analysis depends. Let them refuse any longer to be treated only as mass material for work in the factories and fights on the battlefields.

We are fighting a people's war in which the people have the right and the duty to make their demands known, of insisting that they shall be drawn into the leadership of their own war.

There is a burning need for more confidence in the ranks of the workers at this critical moment. For we more than any other section of the community spurn the idea that General Winter is an ally.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We refuse to be thankful that Russian snow will soon envelop that great land, for we know it can become an avalanche which can swamp Britain because of the refusal to open the Second Front.

We spurn the doctrine to be found in some sections of the people, whom capitalism has treated so badly in the past that they are afraid to make further sacrifices of Trade Union customs because they are more afraid of peace than they are of war.

We will approach every task in the spirit of the greatest confidence, confident of the rôle of the Labour movement, of the leadership that is to be found in our own ranks, the fearless exercise of which perhaps more than anything else at this stage could put new heart into the entire nation, dispel hesitancy and smash tendencies to political demoralisation.

The epic and never-to-be-forgotten example of the common peoples of the Soviet Union has awakened the masses everywhere to a realisation of their own power and strength. It is time to demonstrate this in practice, time to sweep aside every person and obstacle that stands in the way of the all-out mobilisation of the British people on the basis of equal participation and sacrifice alongside the Soviet people.

They are plugging a song on the B.B.C. just now, "This is worth fighting for." The Russians have never heard of this song, but in everything they are doing they are proving that they know what it means in terrible but glorious reality.

We, too, have something to fight for, something that is worth fighting to attain. It is the victory over Fascism. It is the strengthening of working class and national unity to make it a certainty, and then when the victory has been won, the advance with giant strides to the achievement of Socialism so that in very truth the new world can be built in the only way this will ever be possible, through the leadership and genius of the common people taking the destinies of their country into their own hands.

This it is which demands that whatever we have done before we shall do more now. This it is which demands that throughout every Government institution, in the ranks of the Government itself, in every factory and regiment, on every aerodrome and ship, through Parliament and every local and town council, the keen fresh winds of working-class determination and resolve shall blow, sweeping the dead wood and cobwebs aside, reinvigorating the entire nation and people with the inflexible resolve that victory shall be won not in terms of years but in terms of months of short, sharp, decisive and victorious battles.

One hundred years ago, in the autumn of 1842, Karl Marx entered on his public political activity. He became the editor of the radical newspaper the *Rheinische Zeitung* (Rhenish Gazette), in which he carried on a democratic political fight. A year earlier, when he was 23, a friend described him: "Imagine Rousseau, Voltaire, Holbach, Lessing, Heine and Hegel united in one person..... that is Dr. Marx!"

Roy Pascal, Professor in the University of Birmingham, has written a booklet (which will be published this month by LABOUR MONTHLY) on

Marx as political fighter for Democracy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Situation in the U.S.A.

by BRUCE MINTON

(Washington Correspondent of the *New Masses*)

(By Cable)

Washington, September 19.

ONE result of President Roosevelt's Message to Congress on the need for legislation to hold farm prices in line and to meet the danger of inflation has been to return the initiative to the administration spokesmen in both Houses, Senate and House of Representatives. Not that the wilful minority has acquiesced quietly to the President's message. They have attempted to palm off "formulas" that would permit inflation and victimise labour. Rather than keep farm prices within reason the southern Bourbons have cooked up a mess that has encouraged further price rises in farm commodities. Concurrently professional labour baiters have raised hue and cry about wages, demanding that the workers' pay be frozen regardless of sub-standard levels that undermine efficiency and morale and thereby are impeding production.

President Roosevelt flatly rejected such formulas and reiterated his demand for effective legislation. Small and middle farmers have little interest in inflated prices. In fact, the high prices as envisaged by the Farm Bloc would injure the majority of farmers more than they would help them. It would work untold hardship on consumers. A rise in living costs would limit the market of small farm producers; they would be placed in danger of losing their land; and only the largest agricultural corporations and real estate speculators would benefit.

The plot to pervert the President's Message into an anti-Labour crusade has made little headway. As this is written the War Labour Board (the agency appointed by the President to handle Labour disputes, in particular demands for wage adjustments) has awarded increases in hourly wages to employees of General Motors engaged in building tanks, trucks and other war material. Previously a substantial increase had been granted to miners of non-ferrous metals who have for long been sufferers from sub-standard wages—and suffering to such a degree that miners were migrating to other war jobs where conditions and pay were far more attractive. The supporters of the administration in Congress were able to prevent the most sweeping wage plans for the wage freezing. As matters stand the Congress will probably not disturb the War Labour Board's ample authority to stabilise wages—a far cry from freezing.

The leadership exercised by the President has been welcomed by the Labour Unions and by the people as a whole. Already too much time has been wasted in the changing over of American economy to wartime needs and to the all-out economy insisted upon by Earl Browder and by the Communist Party. Vacillation and hesitation have delayed production: responsible administration spokesmen admit that present production is far below industrial capacity and is perhaps only one half of the nation's potential. Donald Nelson, the chief of the War Production Board in charge of production and allocation of materials, has promised to get "tough." As yet it has not been indicated exactly what he intends to do and "dollar-a-year" members of the Production Board still maintain a leisurely pace that is too reminiscent of "business as usual."

To Nelson's credit, he at long last has conceded the importance of granting Labour a voice in production. He has asked the American Federation of Labour and the Congress of Industrial Organisations to nominate vice-chairmen to sit on a five-man-board working with the War Production Board in its industry and production sections. This pattern of co-operation and consultation will also extend to the regional offices. Philip Murray, the President of the Congress of Industrial Organisations, has hailed Nelson's acceptance of Labour representatives as the farthest development in drawing the Unions officially into the war effort.

Slowly American industry is being geared to the needs of total war, too slowly perhaps, but the momentum

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mounts. The Unions and the people see this increased effort as a promise of our ability to maintain and expand the western front once opened. A substantial section of the American press is calling for a European bridgehead in force and has been waiting for it ever since Molotov visited Washington. Churchill's talks in Moscow and the President's definite intimation that offensive action can be looked for in Europe in the near future has led to a widespread expectation that the Second Front is about to be launched.

But Raymond Daniell, the London correspondent of the powerful *New York Times*, has just cabled a story (which was passed by the British Censor) pointing out that the British and American Governments have now decided that the Second Front this year is an impossibility. For months, Daniell has taken it upon himself to throw cold water on the Second Front agitation. His latest "semi-official" news story has been greedily seized upon by the appeasers. There is no doubt that an attempt will be made to use Daniell's despatch in order to discourage the pressure for offensive action. Yet it is well understood throughout the nation that for all the relief that is felt over the repulse dealt to Rommel, for all the pride and satisfaction over the recent gains in the Solomon Islands and in the Pacific Ocean—it is well understood that at Stalingrad and on the Eastern Front the war is in the balance.

The American Labour movement increasingly exerts pressure for the Second Front. The Unions are rapidly emerging as a powerful factor in the drive for victory. With a growing understanding of Labour's central rôle in the war effort the need becomes more pressing than ever to cement unity between the American Federation of Labour and the Congress of Industrial Organisations. No date as yet has been set for the first meeting of the Joint Committee to discuss Murray's recent unity proposals. But it is expected that the Conference will occur within a month.

Fully as important is the question of international Labour unity. Unfortunately, the appeasers within the American Federation of Labour Executive Council —notably William Hutcheson (Carpenters), Matthew Woll (Photo-engravers), egged on by arch-defeatist John Lewis (President of the United Mine Workers) —have been able to prevent affiliation with the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee. Sir Walter Citrine's negotiations here are now recognised to have been ineffectual, at best exceedingly inept. He delayed unity by pointedly refusing to discuss fraternal relations with the Congress of Industrial Organisations and the Railroad Brotherhoods. Citrine coldly dismissed every attempt to persuade him to a less insulting course. Through his attempts to make a "deal" exclusively with the American Federation of Labour, the Hutcheson clique within the Federation's Executive defeated President William Green's advocacy of affiliation and substituted a proposal for relations only with British Unions, excluding Soviet Unions from participation. Both Soviet Unions and Trades Union Congress reject this impertinent offer.

In this situation President Murray, of the Congress of Industrial Organisations, has sponsored a strongly worded resolution at the recent Congress of Industrial Organisations Executive calling for strengthened unity "within and among United Nations . . . in accordance with the experience of the united action already achieved between the British and Soviet Trade Unions."

Murray correctly insisted upon drawing in the Latin American Unions under the progressive leadership of Lombardo Toledano. Their inclusion would help to speed the war effort of our southern neighbours and would strengthen the growing Labour movements of such countries as Chile, Argentina and Brazil. The clarity of the Congress of Industrial Organisation's position will surely aid the pro-war majority of the American Federation of Labour to defeat the appeasers. In addition, any move that forwards Trade Union unity on a world scale only smooths the way to labour unity here at home.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soldiers' Pay and The Second Front

by GUNNER X-RAY

AT a time when the whole country is impatiently demanding a Second Front, and when the Forces equally with civilians are anxious for action, it is regrettable that the Government should choose to demonstrate its disregard for the demand for a substantial rise in servicemen's pay and allowances.

To-day, prior to our great offensive, is the time when the servicemen should once and for all be made to feel that they and their families are the first care of the nation. But the Government's attitude is only too reminiscent of their peace-time treatment of the unemployed.

In the debate in Parliament on September 10 it was made abundantly clear that the Members as a whole, irrespective of party, were completely dissatisfied with the meagre increases proposed by the Government. Apart from the two official Government spokesmen, Sir Stafford Cripps and Sir James Grigg, some 31 members made speeches in the debate. Of these, 29 were severely critical, the remaining two (Mr. Hely-Hutchinson and Major Sir E. Cadogan) were, in the words of Mr. J. J. Davidson, "the only Members to support the Government's proposals . . . in a tepid manner." Of the 29 who were critical, 17 represented the Services, including one naval rating, while Major Sir E. Cadogan was the only representative of the Services to support the Government's proposals.

The debate was preceded by the publication of that notorious White Paper, a document which was met with ridicule and ribaldry in the barrack-room, and received no better reception in Parliament. In the course of the debate it was variously described as a "Yellow Paper" (Major Profumo), "tendencious" (Miss Rathbone), "the worst piece of publicity that has been issued for a long time" (Mr. Beaumont), "utter and contemptible nonsense" (Mr. J. J. Davidson), "an atrocious document" (Major Wise), "a disgraceful piece of jiggery-pokery" (Capt. York), and "a tissue of lies" (Major Marlowe). This last gallant gentleman even suggested that the author should be strung up on a lamp-post!

In contrast to the White Paper the debate was a straight and honest statement of the grievances of servicemen to-day, with ample constructive proposals. If the Government had made the debate its starting-point, it could have formed a clear idea, based on the combined all-party views of Members, of what the country and services want.

But alas! The White Paper was already in print and the Government's proposals were already cut and dried. And the Government's own attitude during the debate was such that the penultimate speaker, Capt. York, was constrained to comment: "We have seen no sign from the Government that they have paid the least attention to what every serving Member of this House who has spoken to-day has said." So, instead of using Parliament as a Council of State, an unfortunate impression was created, and the Government has made necessary a further period of campaigning for the servicemen just at a time when unity for the Second Front, and not arguments over soldiers' pay, should be the order of the day.

* * *

What are the main points that emerge from the debate?

First, there is the simple fact that the ordinary single private soldier has not enough pocket money to mix as an equal with civilian men or women, or with members of the Allied Forces. Still less can he entertain a girl, or afford to finance his own marriage. The addition of 6d. a day was generally condemned as inadequate, many Members would have been satisfied with a shilling, and a number of them showed how utterly misleading was the White Paper's estimate of the soldier's basic pay as being the equivalent of £3 a week to a civilian. Mr. W. Edwards, speaking as an ordinary rating, having allowed for stamps and cigarettes, showed how the ordinary ranker is left with approximately 1s. a day in his pocket.

Against this background the demand of W. Gallacher for a basic rate of 5s. a day seemed only reasonable, and was echoed in a milder form by Capt. York, with a proposal of 4s. a day, with 6s. after three years' service.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The soldier wants to fight; and surely he will fight well as soon as the Second Front is opened. But an enormous positive effect would result with regard to his morale if he were sent into battle feeling that the Government really had his welfare at heart, and if, before being sent into action, he had been able to mix with civilians as an equal, and not always as an object of charity. Nobody demands that soldiers' conditions should in all respects be the equal of civilians'. If this were possible, conscription would not be necessary. But, as Major Profumo said, the soldier "must be free to go into battle knowing that he is a trusted and well-paid servant of the State." In a war for Democracy and progress it is essential that the soldier should be inspired by such feelings.

Far more urgent, however, than the case of the single soldier is the need of the married man with children: "The men fighting abroad, or training for a Second Front in this country, and the women too, cannot concentrate solely on their duty if they are wondering about their dependants and families at home" (Capt. Grey). "Every day and in every place this comparison is being drawn, not so much between the men, but between the economic position of the wives and families of serving men and that of men who are doing work no doubt equally important, but in all essential respects far less exacting than that of soldiers, sailors and airmen. No indication has yet been given that the Government regard the matter as serious at all" (Mr. Willink). "For his wife and family he asks for allowances sufficient to enable them to live in at least the comfort to which they are accustomed, sufficient to ensure that they suffer no financial sacrifice not suffered by other sections of the community and sufficient to enable the soldier and his wife and children to look the world in the face" (Major Milner). "The only thing that could possibly break the morale of our sailors, soldiers or airmen would be the conscious knowledge that their people at home, their wives and loved ones, were suffering anguish and poverty" (Mr. Beaumont).

It was generally agreed that the system of war service grants is not only inadequate, but the fact that there are over 500,000 recipients is an indication of the insufficiency of the allowances. The fact that civil servants have their pay made up was cited to demonstrate how the Government itself, as far as its own employees are concerned, had had to admit that army pay and allowances are far too low. It remained, however, for W. Gallacher to put forward a concise scheme for adequate allowances for the serviceman's dependants: "Give his wife £2 a week, every child under fourteen 10s. 6d. and children between fourteen and sixteen at school 16s. a week. Give every mother who has one or more children in the services 25s. a week."

As to the question of where to get the money, Gallacher's proposal was simple: "Bring the Astors and their like down to the level of ordinary people and you will be able to meet the needs of the servicemen." This was a healthy alternative to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's announcement of a few weeks ago, when he refused to tax all income over £2,000 a year on the ground that this would "only" bring in £30,000,000.

A third question which occupied most attention in the debate was the pay of junior officers. As Capt. Grey put it: "A great many people, like the young married sergeant, find that to accept a commission involves them in financial liability which makes them relatively much worse off. . . . I am not satisfied that we are getting the best type, and one of the reasons is that a large number cannot afford it." Mr. Bellenger quoted a report of 1937, drawn up by a committee including such reactionaries as Mr. Amery and Colonel Victor Cazalet, which said: "From the time a young officer joins the Army until, should he be so successful, he has reached the rank of lieutenant-colonel at about forty years of age, he is, unless he remains unmarried or has private means, engaged in a constant grinding struggle to make ends meet." And, to conclude our quotations on this matter, Capt. Taylor reflected: "I wonder how many junior officers have been court-martialled because of financial entanglements."

An essential feature of a democratic army is an effective system of promotion according to ability alone. The debate made it clear that financial reasons are still preventing such freedom of promotion in our Army to-day. And it is time the Labour movement woke up to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact that this question is a vital one, for only when promotion is really on the basis of merit can the working people hope to achieve those leading positions in the armed forces which their numbers and merits demand.

* * *

It is impossible, in an article of this length, to enumerate all the anomalies in the present system of pay and allowances or to detail all the constructive proposals which were made (such as the suggestion that all cleaning materials should be free, that there should be a free medical service and maternity grants to soldiers' families, and so on). It is enough to say that had the Government seriously taken the debate as the starting-point of its proposed reforms a real step forward would have been made.

Of course, in this debate, there were those who, like Sir Edward Cadogan and Sir Roger Keyes, harped on the need to reduce or restrict wages. It is strange that such people never include the abolition of unearned income in their proposals! But the encouraging fact was the small number of such proposals, most M.P.s concentrating on the real matter in hand, a real rise in pay and allowances for the forces.

Sir Stafford Cripps tied himself into an awkward knot by arguing, first, that Army pay and civilian wages cannot be compared because the latter "are regulated by private bargaining between employers and employed," and, in the same paragraph stating that the pay of the Allied Forces "depends upon the general economic conditions of the particular country, *its wage systems*, its social structure." If *their* wages affect their Army pay, why not ours? Mr. J. J. Davidson very appropriately interjected here: "And by the views of its Government."

The net result was that, with the exception of the two official and two "volunteer" supporters of the Government proposals, M.P.s appeared to be genuinely perturbed at the financial situation of the men in the services, and wholeheartedly expressed the view that the men who are to open the Second Front should go into action feeling that they have had a square deal.

But the matter is urgent. And it is not only the Government which, by its policy, can make the soldier feel that he is really an honoured and cherished citizen. In fact, the whole Labour and Trade Union movement, acting through the local authorities and Trades Councils, can take up the welfare of the soldier far more energetically.

Again, up and down the country, almost the sole facilities for the soldiers' leisure are provided by a few religious organisations, the Y.M.C.A., Toc H, the Salvation Army and others. It is time that Trades Councils and local authorities, urged on and assisted by the rank-and-file of the workers, began to cater for the welfare of the troops stationed in their areas.

Repeatedly in the debate it was emphasised that the soldier cannot agitate or organise for his demands. He cannot even agitate for a Second Front. Therefore the responsibility of the Labour movement towards the soldier is doubly great. And it was gratifying to find that so many M.P.s, irrespective of party, recognise that they too bear a special responsibility because of the peculiar political and economic disfranchisement of the soldier. At the same time, it should be the aim of the Labour movement to attain for the soldier full political and citizen rights.

To win the war as soon as possible is the aim of every soldier. That is why the soldier, though unable to speak at public meetings, is anxiously awaiting the Second Front. To assist him, materially and morally, is the job of every civilian. Let him go into battle feeling that the whole people is behind him. Only a vigorous policy on the part of all the democratic and progressive organisations of the country can forge that unity between soldier and civilian worker which is an essential ingredient in a rapid democratic victory over Fascism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

India Must be Freed

by BEN BRADLEY

INDIA'S crisis is Britain's crisis. In face of this urgent situation the demand increases both in this country and in India for steps to be taken to end the deadlock and to win India as a free ally in the fight against Fascism.

The announcement that Mr. Churchill was to make a statement in the House of Commons to be followed by a debate aroused considerable interest in Indian political circles, but no great hope that either the statement or debate would produce anything or bridge the political impasse: a serious matter because indicative of a widespread opinion in India that nothing can be expected from this side. Mr. Churchill's speech can only have had the effect of strengthening this opinion; for so far from making use of a great opportunity to allay this mistrust and to win not only the confidence of the Indian people but a new and great ally in the fight against Fascism, his speech, like that of Mr. Amery, Secretary of State for India, showed that reaction was still in the saddle. The speeches were an expression of complacency that repressive measures had held in check the reactions to arrests of Congress leaders; and their aggressive and belligerent tone has had a serious effect in India, as shown by comments of responsible Indian politicians and newspapers, resulting in further deterioration in the political situation.

The *Civil and Military Gazette*, a newspaper in no way pro-Congress, ironically comments on Mr. Churchill's efforts to belittle the Congress that he had forgotten to add 200,000,000 politically unawakened Indians to his total of non-Congress elements, whereby he could have proved, doubtless to the satisfaction of himself and his audience, that the Congress Party's following is precisely minus 45,000,000. This newspaper's summing-up of the speech is that India had asked for bread and had been given a stone. The *Tribune* of Lahore, a moderate newspaper, speaks of Mr. Churchill's "amazing and wholly inexcusable" ignorance of the representative character of the Congress: "Mr. Churchill," adds the newspaper, "had made many blunders in his time and this one easily tops the list and will prove the most disastrous of all in its consequences." The *Hindu* of Madras declares that Mr. Churchill packed into 400 words more venom and mischievous half-truths than he gave to the House of Commons during the whole of the weary progress of the India Bill. Nationalist and Liberal newspapers generally stated that after negotiating with the National Congress so long and so often it is a bit late in the day for the British Government to begin challenging the representative character of the Congress.

In this country the speech was received by wide sections with dismay and disappointment. The *News-Chronicle* said: "This attitude is a complete bankruptcy of statesmanship," while the *Manchester Guardian* stated "There can be no going back on the offer of independence made to India. But is there to be no further effort to go forward?" As R. Palme Dutt said in his last *Notes of the Month*: "Important sections of democratic opinion in this country are also pressing for a solution." It is disastrous that this found no expression in the Premier's speech.

On the same day that Mr. Churchill was making his statement in the House of Commons, a statement was issued in India urging him to declare India's independence forthwith to enable representatives of the major political parties to form a truly representative National Government. The signatories included the Moslem Premiers of Bengal and Sind, the Nawab of Dacca, the President of the Momin Conference, and the Hindu Mahasabha leaders. Dr. Mookerjee, President of the Hindu Mahasabha, is confident that many other parties and interests will actively support the statement, and emphasised that Mr. Churchill did not realise how strong anti-British feeling was. The Viceroy has, however, refused permission for Dr. Mookerjee to visit the Congress leaders in prison to discuss his proposals.

In Calcutta a meeting of Europeans adopted unanimously a resolution declaring that the British Government should forthwith announce its readiness to transfer full power to a National Government in India and provide imme-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

diate facilities for its formation. Mr. Rajagopalachari, who has been working for unity, warmly endorsed this action of this section of Calcutta Europeans.

Immediate efforts to form an Indian National Government were urged in a statement issued by the leader of the Indian Liberal Federation, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar, the representative of the Indian non-party group. They declared that the recent speeches by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Amery "will in no way help the worsening situation." The demand for independence and for a responsible National Government comes from all sides and is overwhelming. In the Legislative Assembly when it met in Delhi on September 16 information was given by the Home Member of the cost (658 killed) up to the present moment.

On the resumption of the debate in the Legislative Assembly on the present situation, Mr. N. M. Joshi, Labour representative (General Secretary, All-Indian Trades Union Congress) voiced a strong demand for a move by the Government to solve the deadlock. Independence was a national demand, he said, not made by Congress alone. The British did not yet appreciate the advantage of a National Government. They could have an Indian Army many times over a million from an independent India. Production and the war effort in general would be increased ten-fold if the Congress demand for an independent National Government were granted. Mr. Joshi was followed by Maulana Zafar Ali Khan of the Moslem League, who said that Gandhi and Nehru should be released. Sardad Sant Singh made the same plea and drew the lessons from Burma and Malaya which had proved that Britain could not fight both external and internal enemies.

From every side the call comes for a way out, for national unity, for independence, so that India's mighty resources can be thrown into the fight against the world's greatest menace—Fascism. On behalf of the Communist Party of India, P. C. Joshi, its General Secretary, states: "This stalemate cannot last. It is the last desperate stand of reaction. The only problem is: Are we to leave it to the Japanese to break the stalemate, or will the Indian people, in alliance with the British people, break it?" The Communist Party of India is working might and main to secure national unity and to mobilise India's millions and material for the war against Fascism.

The immediate situation is extremely serious and threatening. The Japanese may attack at any moment. A set-back in India is not merely a victory against the Indian people but a victory of the Axis against the people of this country, the Soviet Union and all peoples fighting against Fascism. The present Government policy on India cannot remain unchanged for a moment longer. The question is urgent. The policy of self-satisfaction and complacency—"India is returning to normal"—means continuous repression, and a refusal to acknowledge that in every village and hamlet, in every town and city, the people of India call out for that freedom which *we* are fighting to defend against Fascism.

We must increase our pressure a thousand-fold through our Trade Union organisations, workshops and factories everywhere and demand that the Government immediately declare India independent and reopen discussions with the representatives of Indian opinion.

The C.P. of India in their call to the people of India state: "Not Fascism, but the people will emerge victorious out of this war. This is the guarantee of India's liberation."

We in this country have the power to make this possible to-day. *And we must*—and thus win India as a free ally in the fight against Fascism.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in the LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: 12 months, 7s., 6 months 3s. 6d. Postage paid.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Blackpool and After

by J. R. CAMPBELL

ONE can examine the 1942 Trades Union Congress from two angles. How did it compare with previous Trades Union Congresses and how did it measure up to the great questions confronting the British people at the beginning of the fourth year of the war?

Viewed from the first angle, it was clearly the best of the wartime Trades Union Congresses and reflected the swing of the workers to the left and their desire for a more vigorous war effort and a more determined offensive military policy. Yet viewed from the second angle, the Congress was clearly inadequate to its tasks.

The Second Front

This was most clearly reflected in the debate on the Second Front. No one dared to suggest that there was any other way of obtaining victory over Germany other than by the opening of a European Front by the Anglo-American forces. The General Council resolution which was ultimately carried was careful to stress that

> The Congress, sharing the general desire to give maximum assistance to Soviet Russia, and to hasten the decisive military action which will bring about the defeat of the enemy, pledges the fullest support of the British Trade Union movement so soon as the competent authorities decide that the time has come to launch effective action in Europe.

Those who sponsored this resolution in preference to the A.E.U. amendment calling for the immediate organisation of a Second Front ignored the factor of time. The Soviet Union had been battling with the main forces of Germany and her satellites for fourteen months and we, a world Empire which had up till recently covered one fourth of the world, had not yet launched even a serious military diversion on behalf of our ally. At this period in the last war Great Britain was the main force fighting the Central Powers. Armies were fighting in Palestine, Mesopotamia and Salonika, British divisions were propping up Italy and a huge, if not brilliantly executed, offensive was taking place in France. We are assured that our munitions production (in spite of the gross defects prevailing) is much greater than in that period. Yet at the beginning of the fourth year of a war in which we have not expended a tiny fraction of the munitions we did in the last war, Mr. George Gibson (for the General Council) seriously doubts if we have the equipment to open a Second Front against part of the German Army.

This and other expressions of what might be called the "Dunkirk complex" were too frequently heard from the supporters of the General Council. It has become necessary to remind these gentlemen (who two years ago were strangely enough proclaiming the ability of Britain single-handed to defeat Nazi Germany, provided the flow of American munitions could be stimulated) that a nation can live too long under the memory of its past defeats. For two and one quarter years since Dunkirk millions of British workers have slaved at making munitions, our stores have been filled with munitions from America and while agreeing with Mr. Gibson that "one cannot open a Second Front with a chalk mark on a pavement," nevertheless we suggest that such a front might be opened on the basis of the vast quantities of munitions produced by the workers in this country and the U.S.A.

In a war moving with the speed of this one you cannot command time. The doctrine sponsored by the General Council that we can afford to take our time, carefully building up our forces, perfecting those to the last tank and plane, forgets that in the meantime our ally is being seriously weakened. This leisurely building up of strength behind our sea defences is the historic strategy of Britain. It is fatal, however, to success in a war moving with the speed of this one, it is destructive of the principles of co-ordinated strategy, it expresses a policy of ignorant self-interest and not of co-operation as a partner in an alliance for victory. Did it never occur to any of the supporters of the General Council to ask themselves the question: What would we have said if the whole weight of Nazi Germany had been thrown against Britain and we had waited for fourteen long months for our Soviet ally to set its military forces in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

motion in order to take some of the strain off us ? A too great complacency, a feeling that time can still be wasted, was only too evident in this debate. There was a refusal of delegates to recognise that a Second Front can be delayed, not because of technical difficulties, but because of political objections masquerading as technical difficulties. One would have to be very innocent indeed if one believed that the anti-Soviet section of the ruling class, dominant in the annals of Britain, until recently was not acting as a retarding force with regard to the opening of the Second Front. Has the T.U.C. never heard of "political" generals? Why, then, did a majority of delegates fail to see that support for the A.E.U. amendment demanding the immediate organisation of a Second Front was a contribution to the removal of all the unnecessary obstructive tendencies—political and technical—which still exist?

Indeed, one can say that the majority's trust of the " competent authorities " on the Second Front and on India was in marked contrast to their distrust of the same authorities on the question of the Trade Union Act.

Nevertheless, the support for the immediate organisation of the Second Front came from unions like the Amalgamated Engineering Union, the Mineworkers Federation, the Electrical Trade Union, the majority of the Woodworkers, the Fire Brigade Union—all unions standing in the very forefront of the civilian war effort. The fact that the Congress majority faltered on this vital question should only be a spur to the trade unionists in the other Unions to win their societies for support of the immediate organisation of a Second Front. No manipulation of block votes can conceal from trade unionists the fact that the cause of the United Nations is in deadly peril because of the refusal of the British and U.S. Governments to throw their military forces into battle alongside those of the Soviet Union. The fight for the Second Front is a fight for self-preservation and the Trade Union Congress debate should only be a powerful stimulus to us continuing it.

The Drive for Production

On production questions the Congress majority took a much better line—possibly because they felt that they were entitled to include themselves amongst the "competent authorities" on this question. They were clearly not satisfied with the complacent attitude of the General Council which having secured a Ministry of Production and some improvements in Regional organisation was inclined to rest there. The delegates, on the other hand, exposed the still grave deficiencies on the part of the Government and of individual managements. The fact that the main "controls" were still in the hands of the vested interests, that there was yet no sign of a production plan was commented on by a number of delegates, headed by Jack Tanner. It is doubtful, however, if the General Council wants to disturb the "vested interest" controllers, provided the trade union bureaucracy is allowed a limited " place in the sun" alongside of them. Indeed, there is quite a tendency amongst them to co-operate with the employers in given industries in a United Front against the Government or the Civil Services. This is a real danger.

It is therefore of significance that Congress passed a series of resolutions calling for:—

(1) A more effective State control through the Government operating its powers as far as practicable to " take over entirely all industries and personnel vital to the war effort."

(2) The setting up of a Central Planning Board to ensure the best use of scientific and technical resources.

(3) The compulsory setting up of production committees in all scheduled undertakings, these committees to contain representatives of the scientific and technical staffs.

(4) Trade Union representation on Boards of Management.

(5) The adequate representation of the Unions on Ministry of Supply Controls.

(6) The better use of woman power.

The need for the Unions giving the most active help to their members on production committees was emphasised by a number of delegates. In dealing with the functions of the new Joint Trade Union District Production Committees set up to supervise the work of the individual production committees in the factories, the report of the General Council outlines the following activities : (1) Approve the nomination of production com-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mittees and prepare the necessary ballot papers; (2) to generally supervise the work of these committees; (3) to enter into negotiations where appropriate with the local Federation of Engineering Employers.

There is an atmosphere of negation about these functions, as if the Unions wanted to restrain the production committees instead of encouraging them. Clearly the District Committees ought to act as clearing-houses. They should popularise the achievements of the most successful committees as an encouragement to the others.

International Questions

International questions bulked largely in the Congress deliberations, particularly in relation to Trade Union unity and India.

The General Council had taken the initiative on Sir Walter Citrine's suggestion of trying to start an Anglo-Soviet-American Trade Union Committee, but it was clear that they had underestimated (*a*) the anti-Soviet trends in the reactionary American Federation of Labour and (*b*) the significance of the other American Trade Union centres, the Congress of Industrial Organisations and the vast Railway Brotherhoods. Nor had they foreseen the unfortunate political results that the failure of this initiative might have.

The proposal was seized upon by the reactionary isolationist and anti-Soviet press as a glorious opportunity for delivering a blow at the anti-Fascist forces throughout the world and the press campaign which greeted Citrine was a violent one. The American Federation of Labour not only refused to associate with the Soviet Trade Unions, but indicated clearly that if the British T.U.C. decided to negotiate with the Congress of Industrial Organisations on this question the American Federation of Labour would break off relations with the British Unions. At this stage the T.U.C. had the choice: either negotiations would have to be abandoned for the time being, or there could be capitulation to the American Federation of Labour. The British Trade Union representatives, on the plea of retaining old friendships, chose the latter course and agreed to the formation of an American Federation of Labour and T.U.C. Joint Committee. What purpose this body could serve was not clear, for the American Federation of Labour has already long established relations with the British T.U.C. Both the Soviet Trade Unions and the other American Trade Union centres treated this proposal with the contempt it deserved, and when the Trades Union Congress heard that the American Federation of Labour—T.U.C. Committee had decided not to meet meantime, most of the delegates hoped that it never would. Finally, Congress passed a resolution on Trade Union unity which declared that the General Council should "continue in the spirit of international solidarity to develop wartime relations between the Trade Unions in all the United Nations which will facilitate the reconstitution of the International Federation of Trade Unions as a world-wide organisation after the war." Let it be hoped that the General Council will understand that the great Congress of Industrial Organisations trade unions and those of the Railway Brotherhoods are included in the "Trade Unions in all the United Nations."

India

On India the line of the General Council was equally unfortunate. After recognising what happened in India might make for allied victory or defeat, the General Council went on to stress the necessity of the Government's arrest of the Indian Congress leaders, whilst hoping that no opportunity of reopening negotiations would be lost. There was gross imperialist bias in this statement, in which Sir Walter Citrine outdid the Prime Minister in what was surely one of the most hysterical and illogical speeches ever delivered in an assembly of trade unionists.

In reply to the criticism of delegates who doubted the wisdom of the General Council's statement that the British Government would honour its pledges to the Indian people after the war was over, Sir Walter declared that when Nazi-ism was smashed there would be such an upsurge on the part of the liberated peoples throughout the world that no British Government would dare go back on its pledges. A minute later he was declaring that there was no unity amongst the Indian people, that if any so-called self-government was granted now seventy million Moslems would resist to the point of civil war and the Untouchables would

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

support them. That seventy million Moslems, or that even a bare majority of Moslems, were behind the Moslem League and its threats has been disproved over and over again in provincial elections and otherwise. It was lamentable enough that the Secretary of the British Trade Union movement should repeat this oft-refuted lie, still more lamentable that he did not see it was on the basis of precisely such arguments that the British Government would refuse to carry out its promises after the war. When one remembers that barely an hour before this outburst Sir Walter was chiding the British Government for using the war as an excuse for not giving justice to the British trade unionists by amending the Trade Union Act, the outburst is seen to be as contemptible as it was illogical.

Working-Class Unity

On the question of working-class unity, the Congress registered substantial progress, despite the furious resistance of the General Council, a majority of which appear to be miserable victims of an anti-Communist phobia. Once the word Communist is mentioned, they become wildly irrational and scream the first thing that comes into their head. Thus Mr. Marchbank hinted that if the war situation changed, the Communist Party policy might change also. Every delegate in Congress understood this to mean that if the Soviet Union made a separate peace Communist policy would change. The depths of anti-Soviet and anti-Communist malignity in the hearts of the General Council majority could not be more clearly revealed. For fourteen months the Soviet Union has battled alone against Nazi Germany without even a serious military diversion from one of its allies. In any given week of that period it has sustained more military casualties and inflicted more on the soldiers of the enemy than Britain has done in the entire war, and at the height of a battle the like of which the world has never previously seen a member of the General Council majority which is in favour of standing by and spectating until our "competent authorities" think they are ready, suggests that there is a danger of Russia making a separate peace.

Although the Labour Research Department is not in any way a Communist organisation, the main attack on the Communists was launched during that debate. Sir Walter Citrine outshone his misrepresentations on the question of India when he asserted (1) that the Communist Party has two categories of members, *i.e.*, ordinary members and associate members; (2) that Comrade Page Arnot was one of the joint secretaries of the Communist Party when "Mr. Pollitt was out" and (3) that the Communist Party was so eager for the war effort that it seemed to some of them that it would not stop short of the enslavement of the people of Great Britain.

The wild inaccuracy of the first two statements may be taken as illustrative of the gross inefficiency of Sir Walter's "Research" Department, but what does the last statement refer to? If it is an oblique reference to the Communist Party's production policy, it is only necessary to point out that the main resolution of Congress calls "upon the workers of all grades and categories and especially upon trade unionists to give the increased production of all the weapons and munitions of war which will make this the year of victory."

The miserable character of these arguments was not lost on the delegates. Over two million votes were cast for the withdrawal of the ban on the Communists, over 1,900,000 against the ban on the L.R.D. The latter would have been carried but for the unfortunate absence of a miners' delegate with the voting card in his pocket. Unity is on the march in spite of the anti-Communist mania of the General Council.

Anti-German Mania

But the most striking revelation of the mind of the anti-Communists on the General Council was the denial of the existence of the two Germanies by the Congress President, Mr. Wolstencroft, and the conclusions that were drawn as to the necessity in post-war years to "hold down the German nation" and to keep eighty or ninety million Germans "under bond."

It would never occur to the uninstructed readers of this speech that nine years ago there was a German Trade Union movement led by men whom the British T.U.C. was proud to call their comrades, and indeed (on questions like co-operation between employers and employed) their guides; that this movement

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stood for precisely that same policy in international relations as the British T.U.C., and though weak and inconsequent, it was a sufficient barrier to Hitler's plans to be broken up by violent seizure of its property and murder or imprisonment of some of its outstanding leaders. The concentration camp is surely a sufficient proof that there is another Germany being held down by violence. In what other country at war to-day is there such an open, public building of formations of specialised troops organised to hold down the civil population in the event of a military defeat. The existence of the other Germany is attested to by great public acts of the Nazi Government.

It is a poor service to that other Germany to tell the German people that in the event of Hitler's defeat the Allies will "hold down the German nation." True, in the event of no revolution occurring in Germany the Allies will have to take precautions against the German State breaking out in war again. But the building of a system of collective security which restrains German militarism cannot be described as holding down the German people. Indeed, it will help them to rise to their feet.

It will not be lost on trade unionists, however, that it is precisely those who are most reluctant to come to grips with the Nazi army, who are most eagerly proclaiming their desire to punish the German people.

Council Without Vision

The General Council is manifestly not looking ahead on questions of Trade Union policy and development. By a very narrow majority Congress rejected a resolution moved by the National Union of Railwaymen calling for an examination of trade union structure and constitution. The phrasing of the resolution was not very happy, but some of the remarks of Sir Walter Citrine, who opposed, were exceedingly significant. After relegating the possibility of a Socialist economy in Britain to "the very distant future," Sir Walter argued that it was impossible to plan trade unionism in Britain, that trade unionism was a natural growth and that when any problems arose out of this growth the General Council was there to assist in their solution. The Municipal and General Workers were ready in the event of the N.U.R. resolution being carried, to move a resolution asserting that "no general resolution adopted by this Congress can bind its affiliated organisations to any policy designed to limit the rights of the Unions to cater for membership in accordance with the provisions of their own rules and the determined policy of their own Executives." In other words, the General and Municipal Workers claimed the right to organise workers in any sphere of industry that their Executive might decide, though on the previous day they had violently complained that the Chemical Workers' Union, originally confined to the light drug trade, was now claiming the right to organise in all sections of the chemical industry. Obviously, these assertions of the right of the sovereign Trade Union to be a law unto itself read strangely alongside other Congress demands for the planning of industry and agriculture. There is, of course, a germ of truth in Sir Walter's argument. One must take into account the historical development of trade unionism and, alas, of the vested interests therein. It is therefore impossible to fit Unions into an academic plan. But it is not impossible to suggest amalgamations, to delimit spheres of influence, to organise joint recruiting campaigns—in short, to plan future development. It is vitally necessary to look ahead, and to evolve a policy that will enable the unions to consolidate their wartime gains. We need to see "the end of *laissez faire*" as far as the Unions are concerned.

We cannot, therefore, be content with the undoubted progress revealed by Congress. The leaders are learning nothing and forgetting nothing. They are not prepared to risk all for the defeat of Fascism. They are not prepared to think ahead on trade union policy. A much more powerful effort is therefore required on the part of the organised workers to win for the policy of the Second Front all those trade unions whose delegations voted against this policy at the T.U.C.; to see that the resolutions of Congress on production are implemented, and that all barriers to Trade Union unity, national and international, are blasted away. The Blackpool T.U.C., inadequate as it was, gave full justification for the belief that these aims are capable of immediate realisation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How the Ban was Lifted

by WILLIAM RUST

THE lifting of the ban on the *Daily Worker* on August 26, 1942, marked the culmination of one of the greatest mass campaigns in the democratic history of this country. Millions joined in a fight which has strengthened our democracy and has protected the freedom of the press. Regulation 2D, which permits the banning of a newspaper without trial, remains on the statute book, but it is now a dead letter.

The ban, which was imposed on January 21, 1941, lasted for one year, seven months and five days. During the whole of this period the fight for republication was not relaxed for a single moment; the campaign grew in strength and was finally successful because in the last stages the demand for the lifting of the ban was taken up and fought for by the mass organisations of the working class, by the Labour Party and the Trade Unions. Thus the campaign for the *Daily Worker* became a great united front movement which thrust upon one side differences which had previously caused distrust and division.

Up to the time of the Labour Party Conference in May, 1942, the Home Secretary and the Government had stubbornly resisted the demand that the ban be lifted, despite the overwhelming verdict of public opinion. But at the Conference the adoption of the following resolution definitely decided the issue:—

> In recognising the different circumstances obtaining since the ban was imposed on the *Daily Worker*, and firmly convinced that all channels possible should be opened for the full-blooded opposition to Fascism, this Conference instructs the Labour Party to exercise to the limit its protestations on the continuation of the ban, and further, whilst giving support to the lifting of the ban on the *Daily Worker*, it is also convinced that the freedom of the press is an integral part of the democratic order, and essential to the maintenance of public morale.

It is true that this resolution was carried by the very narrow majority of 13,000: 1,244,000 votes for and 1,231,000 against. But it was achieved in the teeth of platform opposition and it represented a growing tendency. Therefore the wise saw in this vote the end of the ban, although the foolish still dreamt of its reversal at the Trades Union Congress. This explains why the ban continued for for another three months, in fact, until ten days before the meeting of the T.U.C. By this time it had become clear to all that the Labour Party majority of 13,000 would have jumped to at least 1,000,000 at the T.U.C. The Government judiciously bowed to the will of the organised working class.

The winning of this vast support did not come of itself. It was the result of untiring organisational work based on the principles of the united front, of a persistent combating of misrepresentation and abuse.

The mass opposition to the suppression of the *Daily Worker* did not commence with the change in the war marked by the alliance between Britain and the Soviet Union, although it is certainly true that the campaign grew enormously after June 22, 1941. But already before that turning point in world history a number of national Trade Unions, including the Amalgamated Engineering Union, the National Union of Railwaymen and the S. Wales Miners' Federation, were demanding the lifting of the ban; they were supported by hundreds of local organisations, works committees and shop stewards. The case for the *Daily Worker* was also vigorously taken up by the National Council for Civil Liberties, H. G. Wells, Bernard Shaw, Lord Ponsonby, etc., in the name of the freedom of the press.

During this period the *Daily Worker* League carried on a vigorous propaganda campaign and published a large number of leaflets and pamphlets, including a reprint of thirty leading articles. On April 3, 1941, the Editorial Board of the *Daily Worker* wrote to the Home Secretary seeking an interview and when this was refused forwarded a memorandum to him which pointed out that there was no independent tribunal or other authority to which an appeal could be submitted. In his letter to Mr. Morrison, Professor Haldane stated:—

> The ban on the *Daily Worker* is therefore of a permanent character and means that the public expression of the political opinions represented by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the *Daily Worker* is now brought to an end so far as the daily press is concerned for an unspecified period. At the same time, and by the same means, the public is prevented from learning of facts—however true, however vital to the correct formation of opinion and efficiency of government which the daily press supporting the Government is willing to leave unmentioned.

The reply was that no useful purpose would be served by a meeting between the Home Secretary and the Editorial Board.

Another activity of great importance was the launching of the Industrial and General News Agency on February 14 by several members of the former staff of the *Daily Worker*. The purpose of this agency, which carried on its work until September 4, 1942, was to supply news stories to the general press and to put out a daily bulletin to shop stewards and local working-class leaders, who in return supplied the reports which formed the basis of the news service.

The work of the agency was greatly restricted by the paper shortage—this reduced the bulletin to a duplicated foolscap page—and by the close watch kept by the police, who were on the continuous lookout for anything which could be described as a publication in substitution for the *Daily Worker*. Regulation 2D prohibits a banned paper from appearing under another name, or to use the legal jargon, a publication can be banned if the Home Secretary is satisfied that it "is in any respect in continuation of, or substitution for, the publication of a newspaper named in the order."

The police did, in fact, raid the Fleet Street office of the I.G.I. on March 6, 1941, on the instructions of the Public Prosecutor. A large quantity of papers and other material was removed, but were subsequently returned, no case having been established.

I.G.I. came to play a very useful part in circulating industrial information and news of the *Daily Worker* campaign. By means of this agency the nucleus of the worker correspondents was kept together.

With the change in the character of the war there was a widespread anticipation that the ban would be lifted without much delay. Was not the Government itself now carrying out the very policy—alliance with the Soviet Union—which was the main plank in the *Daily Worker*'s own programme? The view that the ban belonged to a past period and that its continuation was both unjust and undesirable was quickly expressed in the columns of the press, the *News-Chronicle* leading the way. A counter-attack came from the Kemsley-Camrose organs.

The Editorial Board lost no time in making its position clear. Professor Haldane wired to Churchill and then issued the following statement:—

In the event of the ban being raised the *Daily Worker* will (1) give its full support to the Government and do everything possible to strengthen British-Soviet unity in the fight to bring about a people's victory over German Fascism; (2) direct its influence in the factories, mines and Trade Unions towards securing the maximum production for victory; (3) handle international affairs from the standpoint of encouraging the liberation fight of the people in the countries enslaved by German Fascism.

This declaration formed the basis of the mass campaign during the new period.

Anticipations that the ban would be quickly removed were soon dispelled by the answers given to parliamentary questions by the Home Secretary and by the attitude taken up by those politicians and newspapers which represented Munichite tendencies. It became clear that there was a mountain of political prejudice to be removed and that the pro-Fascists would move heaven and earth in order to keep the ban on. Moreover, there were politicians in all three traditional parties who were glad that 2D had been the means of getting rid of an inconvenient rival; their attitude tended to strengthen the vicious hostility, inertia and bureaucracy that had to be overcome by the efforts of the *Daily Worker* supporters.

We therefore turned to the unleashing of a great mass campaign, the primary object of which was to win the support of the Labour, Trade Union and Co-operative movement in such overwhelming numbers as would compel the Government to give way.

It is of interest to describe the apparatus of this campaign. The organisational centre was the *Daily Worker* League, the organisation of reader-supporters which was established many years ago. Although a loose form of organisation, it was a means of keeping contact with live wires all over the country.

No campaign can be run without finance, but this was the least of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UN2.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

League's worries. One of the most inspiring aspects of this fight has been a steady flow of finance from the former readers and new supporters, averaging over £1,000 a month all through the period of the suppression.* What greater devotion could be expressed than this unfailing sacrifice on behalf of a paper that no longer existed? And what unbounded confidence! Every penny was a proof of the permanent place that the *Daily Worker* had won in the hearts of the British people. In the end, those who gave were amply rewarded.

But here again it was a question of organisation. Money did not drop into the lap of the campaign organisers like manna from heaven. On the contrary, it had to be gathered in with the utmost care. The backbone of the financial support were the collecting groups in the factories, which had been regularly collecting over a long period of years; they were strongly supplemented by thousands of individual donors. How to keep in touch with them now there was no paper? A system of intimate postal connection was set up; the weekly circularisation totalled 4,500 and in addition there were a large number of personal letters in reply to fund supporters. Every contributor received a receipt.

The weekly circularisation always contained a letter dealing with the Fund and a printed bulletin (Campaign Notes) containing news of the anti-ban fight. Since July, 1941, an eight-page pamphlet containing a commentary on current political events was also included. This commentary played a big part in the stimulation of the campaign: it analysed current affairs in such a way as to supply a spur to action and to make the reader even more conscious of the importance of getting the *Daily Worker* back. Although only privately circulated, this commentary was in constant and growing demand. The print had to be limited to 7,000 copies weekly.

All this activity was, of course, vigorously supported by the Communist Party, whose remarkable growth during this period brought great new support to the *Daily Worker*.

Through the co-ordination of the work of the *Daily Worker* League, the Fighting Fund and the Industrial and General Information, it was possible to bring into existence a powerful battering-ram. The day-to-day work was carried out by such members of the *Daily Worker* staff as continued to be available.

The secret of the success of the campaign was the persistency of effort; it never came to a dead end or petered out. We were always preparing for the next stage before the current one was exhausted. In fact, we had already worked out our plans for after the Trades Union Congress if the ban had not been removed! Of great importance was the spirit of confidence in final victory which dominated all of our work, a spirit which sprung from our belief in the power of the masses and the virility of the democracy which the British people are fighting to preserve.

During the summer and autumn of 1941 the campaign began to sweep the country like wildfire. Trade Union support reached remarkable proportions, and bishops, artists, scientists and authors all raised their voices in support, despite the widespread counter-campaign which more and more took the defeatist form of suggesting that in the event of the Soviet Union making a separate peace that the *Daily Worker* would then change its policy. Consequently, the *Daily Worker* could not be trusted and the ban must remain. This "argument" was given great prominence even as late as May, 1942, at the time of the Labour Party Conference.

Those who resorted to this kind of propaganda showed that they were indifferent to the harm done to the allied cause providing they succeeded in keeping the *Daily Worker* down. Moreover, the fact that it became the only article in their shop window was an admission that they had abandoned the reasons given in January, 1941, when the ban was first imposed. The result was that although this counter-campaign caused a great deal of confusion and was most certainly detrimental to the war effort it turned out to be a boomerang.

Why ban a newspaper for one set of reasons and then invent a completely new set when the first have obviously lost whatever justification was originally claimed for them? Apart from certain elements who had a political axe to grind all sections of democratic opinion, including those who had previously supported the

* Total £23,186.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ban, began to swing over to the side of the *Daily Worker*.

But it was a hard fight. The most effective weapon of any political campaign is a daily newspaper. But that was just what we lacked, precisely what we were fighting to get. Later the support given by the *News-Chronicle* was reinforced by the *Manchester Guardian*, *Evening Standard* and the *Daily Mirror*; towards the end of the fight the *Daily Express* also came in. But although this support was highly valued by us and helped considerably it was confined to occasional leading articles and news reports.

The Munichites fought us to the bitter end. To them the issue was quite clear; the reappearance of the *Daily Worker* meant above all a great strengthening of the fight for the Second Front. Therefore, keep the *Daily Worker* down. Publicity was given to their views and not to ours.

In this situation the central task of the campaign leaders was to keep the *Daily Worker* issue before the public, not to allow it to die down for a single moment: to answer the arguments of opponents and to show convincingly the job that the *Daily Worker* could do in the strengthening of the war effort against Fascism. If these efforts had been relaxed, then despite the justice of the *Daily Worker's* case the paper would have become a forgotten thing of the past and the Munichites would have carried the day.

The various broadsheets issued by the *Daily Worker* League, which reached a total circulation of two million copies, had a sensational effect on the development of the campaign. Linked up with the existing political situation they gave an impetus to the mass movement and revived memories of the banned paper. Every copy was a practical demonstration of the job that the *Daily Worker* itself could be doing. As to be expected, the usual attempts were made by the authorities to restrict the sale on the grounds of the contravention of paper regulations, etc. But the intimidation had no effect.

These broadsheets prepared the way for the great effort which was whipped up around the first anniversary of the ban, which was made the occasion of a new approach to the Home Secretary. The letter sent by the Editorial Board ended with the following words:—

> We can assure you that, for our part, we are extremely anxious, in the interests of national unity, to end a situation which is the cause of certain conflict and suspicion at a time when all political effort should be subordinated to the successful prosecution of what the Prime Minister has described as the "long and hard war" against Hitlerite Germany and its allies.

At the same time pressure was brought to bear on Members of Parliament and numerous deputations were organised; while every possible conciliatory step was taken in order that the Government could find a way out and retreat with dignity. Mr. Morrison's reply was that "no useful purpose would be served" by meeting the Editorial Board.

All through January, 1942, the anniversary month of the founding of the *Daily Worker*, mass meetings were held at which speakers representing various shades of democratic thought put the case for the lifting of the ban. To the extent that the Government proved adamant, so did the campaign broaden and become more powerful.

The attitude taken up by the Home Secretary to the proposals made by the Editorial Board on the occasion of the completion of the first twelve months of the campaign marked, indeed, a turning-point in the campaign. It showed that political prejudice was so strong that reasoned arguments were of no avail; that only a much stronger mass pressure could achieve the return of the paper.

We therefore turned to the working out of long-term mass campaign and deliberately set ourselves the task of winning the majority of the Labour, Trade Union and Co-operative movement as well as the widening of the general democratic support. We did our best to stamp out demoralising speculation expressed in the constant repetition of such questions as: when do you think the ban will be lifted, or do you think they will ever lift the ban. Our attitude was that the ban would be lifted just as soon as the mass movement was strong enough to force the Government to change its policy.

As part of the new lines of campaigning a series of district conferences were held. All of them were of a united front character and strongly representative of the Labour movement; the greatest was the one held in the Central Hall, Westminster, on March 21, 1942. To this conference was read Lloyd George's famous

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

message which declared that "the continued suppression of the *Daily Worker* was an act of despotism and sheer spite."

This conference was a conclusive proof that the Labour movement could be won for the lifting of the ban. The E.C.s of two of the biggest unions in the country (miners and engineers) were officially represented and their delegates addressed the conference. No fewer than 1,903 delegates were present, representing 645 organisations and 177 factories, including the largest in London. Taking place at the same time as the Morrison threat to use 2D against the *Daily Mirror*, it focused attention on the general question of press freedom. The fight of the *Daily Worker* was seen as a fight for the defence of the rights of all newspapers.

Throughout this period the *Daily Worker* League succeeded in building up a close connection with the various organisations of the working class and a friendly relationship with many of the leaders. The number of Trade Unions and co-operative societies in favour of the lifting of the ban increased day by day. Several of them sent deputations to the Home Secretary. The systematic lobbying of M.P.s also began to yield results.

Then came the Labour Party Conference and the Congress of the Co-operative Union. The latter body was also in favour of lifting the ban, although the resolution it passed was couched in ambiguous and qualified terms.

From June onwards the campaign took on a much more urgent character. Attention was centred on the question of the date. The lifting of the ban was now a certainty, the main issue was to force through the wishes of the Labour movement without delay. The growing tensity of the military situation gave added impetus to the campaign. Against the efforts of the Government to still further delay the lifting of the ban the *Daily Worker* League launched a concentrated drive in order to secure the immediate return of the paper.

It soon became clear that the deadline was September 7, the day of the opening of the Trades Union Congress. No Government would be able to withstand the combined pressure of the Labour Party and the T.U.C. The main aim of the Daily Worker League after the Labour Party Conference was to ensure an overwhelming majority at the T.U.C. The aim was achieved. Already several weeks before the Congress it became clear that the vote was piling up. Fifty-eight Trade Unions with a total membership of 2,662,143 were pledged by conference or E.C. decision to vote for the lifting of the ban and there were eight resolutions on the agenda. On the basis of the 1941 affiliations this represented a majority. There were, however, a number of other Trade Unions whose support was assured. If the issue had gone to the vote there would have been over three million votes for lifting the ban and fewer than two million against.

The significance of these figures is heightened by the fact that the core of the opposition consisted of the two general workers' unions with a combined vote of over one million. Even so, there was a very powerful feeling inside the Transport and General Workers' Union in favour of lifting of the ban, as is instanced by the resolutions passed by the London and Scottish districts.

The Government decided to lift the ban ten days before the Congress met.

The highest point of the campaign between the Labour Party Conference and the T.U.C. was the National Deputation Day on July 29. Called by the *Daily Worker* League, at short notice, it was an overwhelming success. No fewer than 1,500 delegates from nearly 350 constituencies were represented: they came from all over Britain, from Scotland, Cornwall, Norfolk and Wales, from the great industrial centres and many rural areas as well.

All day long they lobbied the House of Commons, where they were admitted in batches of forty and turned the time to good account when they succeeded in getting hold of Members. Many delegates had to stand for hours before they could get into the House, and so great was the queue outside the visitors' entrance that several M.P.s came into the streets to announce their presence and to look for their constituents.

The delegates took with them to the House of Commons a newspaper without a name made up to look like the *Daily Worker* if it had been published on Monday, July 27, 1942. The *Daily Blank*, as it was speedily christened, was a great success. The novelty and daring of the idea greatly appealed to the delegates,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

especially as it gave a glimpse of the paper they were fighting for and seemed to make its return much nearer and tangible. In the House of Commons the *Daily Blank* was the sensation of the day.

The successful conclusion of the fight for the lifting of the ban on the *Daily Worker* is a triumph for national unity and a demonstration of the virility of British democracy. The campaign has shown the strength of the desire for united action in the ranks of the working class and the ability of a popular people's movement to defeat the power of reaction and vested interests.

Moreover, despite the fact that the working people were deprived of the services of the *Daily Worker* for a period of nineteen months, there are certain compensating factors marked by the return of the paper. To-day the *Daily Worker* enjoys a greater prestige than ever and is better known than any other newspaper. It has gathered around itself such a vast body of support that when the Home Secretary lifted his ban the wholesalers, who had refused to handle the paper practically since its inception, also lifted their ban. This does not mean that the re-starting of the *Daily Worker* has been an easy task. On the contrary, owing to the destruction of its premises by Nazi airmen and the refusal of the press monopolists to grant printing facilities, the *Daily Worker* was compelled to purchase a press which was inadequate in a number of respects. Thus the re-publication of the *Daily Worker* has been attended with many technical difficulties plus the necessity for a big effort in the raising of funds.

New successes bring new difficulties, but we are confident that all will be overcome and that the *Daily Worker*, fortified by its experiences, will grow from strength to strength and worthily serve those who fought and sacrificed for it.

Ceux de Valmy: 1792-1942

by ALLEN HUTT

ROOTED deep in the heart and mind of the French people is the tradition and inspiration of the Battle of Valmy, the first military triumph of the French Revolution over the coalition of European reaction. *Ceux de Valmy*—the Valmy boys—is a phrase of idiomatic force. It is no accident that *Valmy* is to-day the title of one of the French people's illegal patriotic anti-Nazi sheets. In 1942 the enemy of France is the German Fascist invader and his French Quislings. In 1792 the enemy was the German invader—headed by militarist Prussia—and his reactionary allies within France.

So that to greet the 150th anniversary of Valmy is by no means an essay in historical incense-burning; it is something very much alive and of the supreme crisis of our time.

Let us imagine ourselves in France in the opening week of September 1792. Since April the German-organised war of intervention has been in full swing. Revolutionary France has met with an unbroken series of military disasters. One after another the historic frontier fortresses have fallen practically without a struggle. On September 2 the Prussians enter Verdun and the high road to Paris, running through the heavily wooded clay hills of the Argonne, is open.

In the ensuing weeks final catastrophe seems almost inevitable. Incessant autumn rain makes the country impassable apart from the few main roads; but the Prussians and Austrians force two of the three gaps in the hills, swing round in the plain, cut the Paris road, and appear in the rear of the main French force, which turns to meet them on a windmill-crowned ridge overlooking the little village of Valmy, a few kilometres west of the Argonne.

The morning of September 20 opens with a heavy mist; as it clears the Prussian artillery opens up heavily on the French positions; a direct hit upon some ammunition wagons, and a consequent heavy explosion, is chosen as the moment to order the superbly disciplined and long invincible charge of Prussia's crack infantry. With faultless precision the veteran masses move up the slope to finish the job with the bayonet.

But . . . the raw troops of France do not break or waver. Their fire is sur-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prisingly accurate and intense. And the Prussian charge is never pressed home; the veterans wilt and withdraw. An astounded German observer speaks for the ages when he cries out, "Here and now begins a new era in world history!" He is a young poet by the name of Goethe.

* * *

The victory of Valmy was inseparable from its political background, which indeed absolutely conditioned it. For the year 1792 was remarkable as a turning-point in the development of the Revolution. Under the leadership of the Jacobins, representatives of the Paris democracy, the capital was made an armed citadel of the Revolution. "The big social fact of 1792," says a Socialist French historian, "was the permanence of political life." Nor was the enthusiasm and conviction of mass political activity confined to Paris; it was true of Marseilles and other centres, whence troops of picked volunteers marched on the capital during the summer—bringing with them the anthem *La Marseillaise.*

The unholy alliance of the *ancien regime* at home with invasion by European reaction made the issue clear; it was not only the defence of the Revolution, but the preservation of the national independence of France. And the world saw how true *patriotism* (the word itself originates with the Revolution) resides in the mass of the people. For it was they who rallied to the cry "the Fatherland is in danger" when their former masters had slunk under the standards of the anti-French coalition, had become the creatures of the German generals.

It was clear that the monarchy was the centre and rallying point of the forces of national betrayal. As the tide of reactionary aggression rolled over the frontiers the Jacobins set themselves to organise the people for the political decision without which France could not be saved. Under Danton's immortal slogan, *de l'audace, encore de l'audace et toujours de l'audace—et la France est sauvee*, the Paris insurrection of August 10 was prepared and triumphantly carried through. With the aid of the Marsailles volunteers the Tuileries—the royal palace—were stormed, the King imprisoned, the Republic proclaimed and a new, widely democratic national Parliament, the Convention, elected.

While this was in process the news from the front grew daily worse; by the turn of August-September, as we have noted, the mounting tale of disaster had reached catastrophic stature. Suddenly, on September 2, there was a spontaneous outburst in Paris. Parties of patriots went round the prisons and dealt out summary justice to some thousand persons. This event, the so-called September massacres, has been more distorted by orthodox historians than almost any other episode of the French Revolution. Let us content ourselves with the contemporary remark of Thomas Jefferson, founding father of American democracy and principal author of the Declaration of Independence:—

> Many guilty persons fell without the forms of trial, and with them some innocent. These I deplore as much as anybody. But—it was necessary to use the arm of the people, a machine not quite so blind as balls and bombs, but blind to a certain degree—was ever such a prize won with so little innocent blood?

The "arm of the people" had indeed struck an exemplary blow at reaction and treachery; and Valmy was the "prize won." For the troops hastening to the frontier in those opening days of September were heartened by the knowledge that the "Fifth Column" had been scotched. They went forward to victory.

TO ALL POSTAL SUBSCRIBERS

Will all postal subscribers kindly note the following two points :—

1. We send out notices of expiry in very good time. Due to paper shortage we are able to give only one reminder. It will greatly minimise work in the office if subscriptions are renewed *immediately* on the form provided [this is essential], but in any case not later than the 15th of the month before the expiry date.

2. Changes of address (except in case of subscribers in H.M. Forces, who are allowed a further seven days) MUST be notified before the 15th of the month, if the next month's issue is to be sent to the new address.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Reviews

A Civil Liberties Text Book

Civil Liberty and the Industrial Worker by Angela Tuckett (National Council for Civil Liberties, 6*d*).

THE NATIONAL Council of Civil Liberties has provided a much needed requirement in publishing this pamphlet. It is more than a pamphlet. It is a text book, a chronicle of events, a written record to which one can refer to and find the "whys and wherefores" of all the conglomeration of emergency regulations under which the population of the country is operating in this most difficult and complex task of mobilising the man and woman power of the country in total war.

No sensible person doubts the need for emergency regulations to meet emergency situations. Have the regulations only a negative side or is there a positive side as well? This booklet examines the questions of Industrial Conscription, Emergency Powers Act, Essential Work Orders, legislation affecting the factory, Home Guard, Fire Guard, Protected Places, regulations affecting meetings and sales of literature in factories, and in examining these complicated matters, does so by giving the historical background, the advantages in addition to the disadvantages of such legislation.

Most people are prone to expose and lay bare the disadvantages, the losses and setbacks of emergency legislation to such an extent that hands are thrown up in despair. That is the negative side. What are the gains? What is this positive side? Is a semblance of guaranteed employment (if only for a week) not something which can be worked to advantage? Is there not an attempt to establish at least minimum rates and conditions? Is there a possibility of protection against victimisation? Is it not a fact that certain unscrupulous employers seek to strengthen their position through the operation of certain orders? Of course there are, but do we all know, are we perfectly clear that there is an answer and legal as well as Trade Union channels through which such employers can be checked and punished by law. These are the ways and means and the booklet shows how it can be done.

Here then is a text book, written in a lively style, written in language which we can all understand. It is outstanding in the use of simple words. A complete absence of "*inter alia*," "*ipso facto*," "notwithstanding nevertheless," which is so much "mumbo jumbo" to the ordinary man and woman who are working and living inside emergency legislation and orders.

Every member of a national executive, district council and shop stewards in the factory should have this booklet at their elbow to read carefully and then to keep on hand to refer to from time to time as circumstance warrants.

J. R. SCOTT.

The Sword and the Sickle

The Sword and the Sickle by Mulk Raj Anand (Jonathan Cape, 9s6*d*, 368 pp.).

THIS IS the third part of Mulk Raj Anand's trilogy of the suffering and awakening of the Indian peasant. In the two earlier parts—*The Village* and *Across the Black Waters*—we saw the first statement of the theme of the new world battling against the old, of Indian society in disintegration even while the Indian individual is achieving a higher degree of integration and personality in the consciousness of struggle.

By his experiences in the last war, the hero, Lal Singh, has learnt that the question of India is not to be settled in terms of industrialism carried out by the great white Gurhar. For fifty-two months he has seen the world drenched in blood by the unbridled greed of the highly industrialised states of Europe. On his return to India for demobilisation he was welcomed back to his native country by an English officer who accused him of having been listening to agitators; and sent him back to his village with the comment that he would probably make a very good farmer—but without any land. Lal Singh returns landless to his village and plays a leading role in organising the peasants against the local landlords and the English "power behind the throne."

This book is not a report: it is an extremely well-written novel. The few words in which I have summarised the plot convey nothing of the beautiful poetic prose of the work, although Dr. Anand's many admirers will know what to expect. *The Sword and the Sickle* is a brilliant study of the earlier immature struggles of India and the consciousness of the organisers that they are "making trouble when they should be making revolution." It is another milestone along the road towards the intelligent view of India as an integral part of the world mosaic.

F. J. BROWN.

Publications Received

Railways and Railwaymen in the Soviet Union, by P. Kingsford, B.Sc. (Lawrence & Wishart, 4*d*, 32 pp.).
Indian Writing (No. 5: Summer, 1942) (Edgar G. Dunstan & Co., 1*s*, 272 pp.).
Food Control in Gt. Britain (International Labour Office, 5*s*, 272 pp.).
The Constitution Under Strain, by A. Berriedale Keith (Stevens & Sons Ltd., 2*s* 6*d*, 72 pp.).
Labour Conditions in War Contracts (International Labour Office, 1*s*, 59 pp.).
The Soviet Countryside, by Joan Thompson (Russia Today Pamphlet, 3*d*, 19 pp.).
Russia's Enemies in Britain, by Reginald Bishop (Lawrence & Wishart, 1*s*, 64 pp.).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY DEVELOPMENT FUND

Amount received during September, 1942 : £60 : 10 : 7

DOING OVERTIME . . .

We were [illegible] that the Labour Monthly has been doing overtime in the [illegible] quarter. [illegible] quarter [illegible] Ex-Servicemen are now quartered [illegible] have come the major battles of this war and we are [illegible] our paper is putting forward." Another reader describes [illegible] the height of the unreal atmosphere" in which she lives [illegible].

"[illegible] Front is, of course, the lifting of the ban on R.[illegible] Many [illegible] come rolling in like a flood; but while their [illegible] our friends not to overlook the Development Fund [illegible]

	£	s.	d.
C. Birch		5	0
Dr. G. Bjerkelbo		5	0
Gunnis Brigh	10	0	
R. S. T.		5	0
Comrades			
[illegible] Bremen	1	[illegible]	
J. Shaw		5	0
W. Irving		2	6
C. G. Ellacott	1	0	0
G. Pendlebury		10	0
M. Friel		5	0
P. W.		5	0
J. H. C.		5	0
Forest Gate D.G.		5	0
Shirebrook D.G.	1	0	0
Fawkham & D.G.	10	0	0
Seward D.G.		5	0
M. Hodgkinson		2	6
Marcus D.G.		5	0
Hadrian D.G.		5	0
Golders Green D.G.	1	15	0
M.W.		2	6
E.H.		2	6
D. Pearce	15	0	
C. Padel		5	0
N. Howard		5	0
E. Mayo		2	6
A. Pugh		5	0
Penrith D.G.		5	0
J. Lee		10	0
R. C. [illegible]		2	6
L. B.		2	6
T. [illegible]		2	6
G. [illegible]		2	6
D. Rea		5	0
Woodford, N. E. D.G.		5	0
R. Oliver		2	6
Dr. R. Young		5	0
G. Emmerson		5	0
[illegible]		5	0
J. C. Gilmour	1	0	0
S. [illegible]		10	0
[illegible]		5	0
[illegible]		5	0
[illegible]		5	0
[illegible]		10	0
[illegible]		5	0
[illegible]		5	0
[illegible]		5	0
[illegible]		5	0
Edmonton D.G.		2	6
Entertainment D.G.		2	6
Red Notting Oddfellows		5	0
Holborn Guild D.G.		5	0
Mrs. Lamont		5	0
[illegible]		5	0
S. Chadwick		10	0
D. Meade		10	0
[illegible]	1	0	0
[illegible]		10	0
[illegible]		5	0
[illegible]		5	0
[illegible]		5	0
[illegible]		5

new pamphlets

THE WAR COMES FIRST

Edited by IVOR MONTAGU

An ascertainable collection of articles from the Soviet Press depicting the mobilisation of the civilian rear in support of the front. 80 pages. **9d.**

ZERO HOUR: SECOND FRONT

IVOR MONTAGU

Reprint from August LABOUR MONTHLY with a new preface and additional material by ILYA EHRENBURG. 16 pages. **3d.**

INDIA: WHAT MUST BE DONE

R. PALME DUTT

Reprint of recent illuminating article, together with new material on India. 16 pages. **3d.**

LABOUR MONTHLY, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

BRITAIN IN THE WORLD FRONT

R. Palme Dutt 5 - net

The heroic defenders of Stalingrad are fighting with their backs to the wall. They ask of us, their Allies, deeds not words. All who read Britain in the World Front will have a clearer idea of the issues at stake, what part Britain could play, and what are the forces which are hindering our answering to the full the call which our Allies now make to us.

RUSSIA'S ENEMIES IN BRITAIN

Reginald Bishop 1 - net

"... Reg. Bishop, by writing this book, has helped substantially towards the Second Front in Europe in 1942, and removed a little further away the prospect of the Second Front in East Anglia in 1943."

—*D. N. Pritt, K.C., M.P., in the Daily Worker*

LAWRENCE & WISHART, LIMITED

2, Southampton Place · London · W.C.1

Published by the Proprietors, The Labour Monthly Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Express Newspaper (C.C.) Ltd., London, E.C.4.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED